3936.a.37

THE CONFERENCE MENTIONED BY DOCTOVR Featly in the end of his Sacrilege.

With some notes, added upon occasion of the Ministers Relation; by S. E.

Facile est vt quisque Augustinum vincat, quanto magis vt vicisse videatur: aut si non videatur, vicisse dicatur, facile est.

S. Aug. Epist. 174.

AT DOWAY,
By the widdow of MARK WYON
at the signe of the Phœnix.

M. DC. XXXII.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO THE READER.

IT is now more then a yeere, COVRTEOVS READER, since first I saw the Sacrilege of M. Featlie, whereunto he hath adioyned a Conference or Disputation had in Paris long agoe with my Lord of Chalcedon. This Conference being short I presently read it ouer, and liked so well some fragments of my Lords Answer which the Minister hath imparted that I desired to see the whole: but could not then get a coppie.

Hauing lighted now at leingth on a Latine one, and liking it exceeding well, I haue thought good to tranſlate it, and impart it vnto others by the print: partly becauſe it is not eaſilie found by ſuch as do ſeeke after it, the Conference being paſt almoſt twenty yeeres agoe; and partly alſo becauſe the Miniſter (who would ſeeme to haue a Coppie) doth cite imperfectlie my Lords anſwers, putting words or peeces together at his pleaſure, and ſometimes adding: and obſcuring the ſence which in the Relation it ſelfe I find to be diſtinct and cleere.

He hath alſo ſtriuen to make good his former Arguments; and inuoluing them in

a new discourse, hath thrust in heere & there what he thought good: wherefore for their sakes that are vnlearned, I will, as oft as there is cause, adde a note; and taking of the new maske of words will let the Reader see that after all his washing, those Ethiopians haue not changed their complexion: and that now this second time of their comming on his Errand they neede not any other answer then that was giuen them before.

In one of his Epistles to the booke I mentioned he demaũds to see another leap, which may be shewed him in good time, meane while you may be pleased to measure this, which

the minister would not haue begunne himselfe to Chronicle, had he not thought it to be extraordinarie.

APPROBATIO.

HÆc Relatio disputationis habitę inter Reuerendissimũ Dominũ Richardũ Episcopũ Chalcedonensem & Danielem Featleum Ministrũ protestanticum de reali præsentia Sacrosancti Corporis Domini nostri Iesu Christi in Eucharistia, vnà cum notis S.E. adiuncti, nihil habet Catholicæ fidei, aut bonis moribus contrariũ prout mihi cõstitit ex fideli relatione cuiusdã S. Theol. Doctoris, qui opus totum perlegit. Actum Duaci 9. Iunij 1632.

GEORGIVS COLVENERIVS *S. Theol. Doct. & Regius ordinariusq; ac primarius Professor, Collegiatæ Eccl. S. Petri Præpositus & Canonicus, Academiæ Duacensis Cancellarius, & librorum Censor.*

αὐτῶ ῥόδον.

IN the yeere 1612. Maſter Daniel Featlie being in France, Chaplaine to the Embaſſadour of our Late Soueraigne, there came to Paris one M. Kneuet, halfe brother to M. Iohn Foord an honeſt & vertuous Gentleman there abiding. This M. Kneuet, being, vpon his arriuall into this Catholike place, put in minde, that he was miſtaken in the matter of Religion, which is the thing a man should principallie attend vnto; and that before Luther all

knowne Churches did beleeue that which he ſaw there in Fraunce openlie profeſſed; tould his brother (M. Foord) he would ſee one of ours defend it before M. Featlie, whome he did eſteeme a greate Scholler. Withall he acquainted M. Featlie with the buſines, & with the point he meant should be diſcuſſed. M. Featlie thinking himſelfe alone hard enough for the whole Church of Rome, vndertooke it: and to performe it with the more applauſe, did prouide himſelfe diligentlie for encounter. At length vpon the third of September, word was ſent

to M.D. Smith (who being then in towne was entreated to vndertake the cauſe,) that he should prouide himſelfe for the morrow.

On the 4. of September there met at M. Kneuets chamber, M. D. Smith and M. Featly. With M.D. Smith came his cozẽ M. * Rainer; & with M. Featly came one M. Iohn Porie, who had beene a burgeois (as it was ſaid) in the firſt Parlamẽt, in King Iames his time. There were alſo preſent M. Iohn Foord, M. Thomas Rant, M. Ben: Iohnſon, M. Henrie Conſtable, & others; not English onelie, but alſo, French: for M. Featly preſu-

* Since Doctour of Diuinitie.

ming the victory, had made the matter knowne. The conference began at noone: and by agreement, M. D. Smith was this time to defend, M. Featly to dispute. Afterwards vpon another daie, M. D. Smith was to dispute, and M. Featly to defend: the rest, not to entermedle.

THE SVMME OF A CONFERENCE BEtwixt M. D. Smith, now Bishop of Chalcedon, and M. Featlie minister, about the Reall presence in the Sacrament: had at Paris, 4. Septemb. anno 1612.

THE conditions of this Conference Master Featlie did not obserue; for whereas it was to haue beene priuate,

before M. Kneuet (for whoſe ſake it was vndertaken) and his brother, onlie ; Maſter Featlie brought to paſſe that it was publike; there being many called vnto it, not English onelie but alſo French. Secondly whereas the conference according to appointment was to be betwixt them two onelie, M. Featlie called M. Moulins thither alſo, though this Miniſter afterwards changing his

minde

minde did not come. Thirdlie, he let not M. D. Smith know of the time of Conference but one daie before they were to meete, whereas he (as wee may iuſtlie beleeue) had prouided himſelfe long before. Whence one of his frinds ſaid the conference would be exact and elaborate.

Before they began to diſpute, D. Smith ſaid the conferẽce was to be, not of trãſubſtantiatiõ,

but of the reall preſence onely, which by order of diſputation ought to be firſt. He ſaid alſo that he was cõtent to graunt vnto M. Featlie the opponents part for this daie, ſo that M. Featlie would promiſe to let him haue it another daie: otherwiſe he would by lots trie who that daie ſhould be opponent. And M. Featlie promiſing that another daie he ſhould propoſe arguments for the Ca-

tholike *tenet*, he willinglie vndertooke the defendants part. But when according to the manner of Oxford he began to declare the ſtate of the queſtion, & to ſhew withall the grounds of the Catholike *tenet*, Featlie cryed out that he would in no caſe giue way thereunto. D. Smith tould him that himſelfe was a Doctour of Oxford, and that he (M. Featlie) was a Graduate of the ſame vniuerſitie,

The Miniſter as I haue vnderſtood by one that was preſent, when he ſaw my Lords opening the queſtion to giue great content to diuers that were there, was ſo netled that he could not ſit ſtill, but roſe vp and ſaid *he would be gonne*

where-

if D. Smith did proceede therein.

wherefore there was reaſon they should obſerue their vniuerſitie-manner. But M. Featlie tooke this in ſo ill part, that he ſaid openlie he would rather omit the conference then permit it: So that D. Smith was forced herein to let him haue his will, leaſt the expectation of the auditorie should heerevpon haue bene fruſtrate: or they take occaſion to ſuſpect that he ſought to decline the

cumbat

cumbat. Wherefore leauing that his fort wherein he might haue iuſtlie ſtaid, and comming out into the open field, he bad M. Featlie bring out his arguments, ſuch as might ſuffice to iuſtifie before God and men his departure both from the Roman Church and all other auncient whatſoeuer, yea and from the Lutheran too in this point; which need to be demonſtratiõs without doubt; for there be not

wanting probable arguments to impugne a truth moſt euident.

D. Featlie in his Relation doth acknowledge that he would not permit my Lord of Chalcedon to ſet downe the confirmations, or shew the grounds, of our *tenet*, and for excuſe pretends that it was againſt the lawes of the diſputation, wherein it was agreed, as he relates, *that Maſter Featlie at that time should onlie oppoſe and D. Smith onlie* * *anſwer*. Whereas it was tould him thē, that it hath been and ſtill is the cuſtome in Oxford for the Defendant to do that which my Lord would haue done; and the Vniuerſitie hath conceaued it to appertaine (as indeed it doth) to the Defendants part: which M. Featlie cauilling

* He should haue added that *M. Featlie should anſwer another daie*: for this was likwiſe agreed vppon; but he could not be brought to do it.

at,

at in the beginning, shewed him-
ſelfe not willing to enter in to the
combat with my Lord of Chal-
cedon if he could haue put it of;
and therefore (being conſcious
of the weakenes of his cauſe)
thought the verie ſight of our
tenet as it appeares to Schollers,
would ouerthrowe his, vtterlie;
and that euerie word by waie of
preface, was an argumentto con-
uince it. The ſame feare and in
the experience of the firſt conflict
much augmented, he betraied
againe afterwards when he was
called vpon to be defendant ac-
cording to promiſe, as appeares
by the end of the relation where
the Reader will ſee with what
ergiuerſation he did shift it of.
And ſince that time alſo in Englād
ſelf twice to my knowledge (I
an put the particulars downe
hen time ſerues) he hath refu

* Ioan. 6. v. 55. 56. 1. Cor 11. v. 24. 25. Cõc. Trid. seſſ. 7. can. 6. & seſſ. 13. cap. 1. S. Tho. 3. p. q. 83. a. 1. ad 2 & a. 2. ad 2. Decret. de Conſec. Diſt. 2 c. 48. & 72.

ſed to meete my Lord, in diſpute.

Being himſelfe in his Relation to tell the ſtate of the Queſtion, he put sdowne a diſcourſe to make the ſimple Reader giddie, to the end he ſee not on which ſide the truth ſtands, and which of the Diſputants haue the vpper hand; whereas the ſtate of the Controuerſie is in it ſelfe cleere & plaine. The Catholikes hold and beleeue that in the holy Eucharist, there is the bodie and blood of our bleſſed Sauiour *trulie, reallie, and ſubſtantiallie.* Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 13. can. 1. condemning ſuch as hold it to be there *onlie as in a ſigne, or in a figure, or in vertue.* Ibidem. * We doe not denie that it is there *virtute*, in vertue and efficacie; it hath vertue & power there, to worke in the Soule; neither doe we denie that it is there as *in a figure*, for the Eucharist is

an

an image of the paſſion: or that it is there as *in a ſigne*, the exteriour ſpecies are a ſigne of that which is within. It is a Sacrament alſo, & a Sacrament is a ſigne. But wee denie that the bodie & blood are there *onlie* ſo; beleeuing that they are there according to the veritie and ſubſtance of bodie and blood.

tantummodo vt in ſigno, vel in figura, aut virtute. ex Can. 1.

The Sacramentariãs, for whom D. Featlie diſputed againſt our Conuict, hold the contrarie: vzt, that the bodie & blood of our Sauiour be not in the Euchariſt truelie according to the veritie and ſubſtance of the thing ſignified by thoſe names, but that the Euchariſt is a ſigne & figure of it onlie. Iewell, *it is not indeed Chriſts bodie*. Peter Martyr, *it is not properlie the bodie of Chriſt*. Muſculus, *it is not the verie bodie*. Carwright, *it is onlie a ſigne*. Perkins, *it is onlie a ſigne and ſeale of*

Cited by my Lord of Chalcedon in the Conference of Cath. & Proteſt. doct. c. 10. a. 1.

The Sonne of God is by the mysticall benediction vnited to vs corporally, as man: but as God, spiritually, with the grace of his spirit renewing our spirit to new life and participation of the diuine nature. S. Cyrill. Alexand. li. 11. in Io. c. 27.

the bodie. Zuinglius, *it is onlie a figure*. Beza, *it was meere bread and wine which our Sauiour gaue with his hands*. Caluin, *the bodie is exhibited according to the vertue, not according to the substance*. And Featlie in his Relation pag. 3. *Christ is not therein according to the substance of his naturall bodie*. and pag. 4. *the words of institution are to be construed figuratiuelie, and not properly according to the rigour of the letter*. And a little before; *not in the proper sence*.

Against this Heresie of the Sacramentarians, we oppose plaine Scripture, and the direct affirmation of Iesus Christ, with the vnanimous interpretation of Antiquitie, and general consent of the Church, in whom the holie Ghost determines controuersies appertaining to diuine faith; and hath determined this which was

beleeued in all ages, and generallie professed in all Christian Countreies, when Luther (who faine would, but in conscience as [a] he said could not cõtradict it) did beginne to deuide himselfe from the Church.

[a] Epist. ad Argentin.

D. Featlie opponent, is to proue the Catholike *tenet* to be false; and that in the Eucharist there is *not flesh and blood, according to the substance of the thing, but a signe or figure of it onlie.*

THE FIRST ARGVMENT.

D. *Featly*. The words of Christ *This is my bodie*, are vnderstoode of a

figure, therefore not of the bodie it ſelfe.

D. *Smith*. I diſtinguish your antecedent.

1. *Of a meere figure*, ſuch as were the legall figures, which the Apoſtle calles Gal. 4. *egena elementa poore elements*, or ſuch as ſtatuaes are in regard of the thinges they doe repreſent; I denie your Antecedent: *Of a figure*

2. *which hath the verity ioyned together with it*, in which kinde the Sonn 4. according to the Apo 4.

ſtle

ſtle to the Hebrewes, *is the figure* of his Fathers ſubſtance: and a Kinge ſhewing in triumph how he did behaue himſelfe in the warre, is, in this later action, a figure of himſelfe as in the former; and breade, expoſed in the ſhop, is a figure of it ſelfe as to be ſold: So I graunt your antecedent, and denie your conſequence. Heb. 1.

D. *Featly*. Tertulliã li. 4. cõt. Marc. c. 40. ſaith: *Acceptum panem, & di-*

ſtributum diſcipulis, corpus ſuum illum fecit, hoc eſt Corpus meum dicendo, id eſt figura corporis mei. The breade taken and diſtributed vnto his diſciples, he made it his bodie, ſaying this is my bodie, that is, the figure of my bodie. Therefore according to Tertullian thoſe wordes are vnderſtoode of a meere figure.

D. *Smith*. You paſſe quickly from Scripture to the Fathers, yet you are woont to ſay, that

the Fathers (though conſpiring all togeather) be not authenticall and infallible expoſitors of the Scripture. wherefore your argument relying vpon the Fathers expoſition, is weakely grounded according to the *tenet* of your owne men. To the place obiected I Anſwer, that Tertullian (as *Lactantius* and *S. Ierome* haue well obſerued) ſpeakes very obſcurelie, and ſometymes placeth wis words

Collat. li. 2. ca. 22.

Lactan. Inſtit. diuin. li. 5. c. 1. Hieron. li. de Inſtit. mon ad Paul.

ſo that it is hard to diſ
cerne amõgſt thẽ which
to which is referd. In the
place alleadged, he
doth not referre thoſe
words, *id eſt figura Corpo-
ris mei*, to *Corpus meum*,
but to *Hoc*. And the
ſence or meaning of
of them is, This, which
once was an old figure
of my bodie, is now my
bodie. And when Ma-
ſter Doctour Smith ſaid
he could bring out of
Tertullian himſelfe in
the ſame place, foure

rea-

reaſons prouing this was Tertullians meaning, and withall cited other wordes of Tertullian, wherein he doth after the ſame manner diſorder the compoſition of the wordes, Maſter Featlie would not ſuffer him to bring thoſe reaſons, neither did he ſay any thing to the places wherein Tertullian had in like ſort inuerted the order of the words: but onely ſaid the order of the wordes (alleadged)

was vnuſuall; and that it followes not they are heere diſordered by this Author, becauſe he had done the like elſewhere. Doctour Smith anſweared that this kinde of confuſion of wordes, and difficultie in expoũding himſelfe, was not vnuſuall in Tertullian; bringing inſtance thereof: & ſaid withall that he did not inferre that Tertullian heere did ſpeake ſo becauſe he had done the like in

Tertullianus creber eſt in ſententijs ſed difficilis in eloquendo. S. Hieron. loc. cit.

other

other places, but becauſe he doth affoord in this very place foure ſeuerall reaſons why he muſt be ſo vnderſtoode: whereof one he produced preſently out of the words obiected. For, quoth he, ſince Tertulliã ſayes that our Sauiour *made breade his owne bodie*, he was not ſo forgetfull as immediately to adde, that the Euchariſt is a meere figure of his bodie. This he ſeconded with ano- 1.

ther, as that Tertullian
2. preſently after the foreſaid wordes, ſaith, *it had not beene a figure &c. figura autem non fuiſſet*, by which wordes he shewes that he ſpeakes of the figure which was before our Sauiour ſaid *hoc eſt corpus meum*, *this is my bodie*. And the booke of Tertulliã being brought he shewed a third reaſon out of other wordes
3. enſuing. *Vt autem & ſanguinis veterem figuram in vino recognoſcas, aderit*

Eſaias

Esaias &c. and that thou mayest acknowledge in the wine an old figure of blood, Esaie &c. Out of which wordes he proued that when Tertullian spake of breade, he spake of an old figure; becauſe he ſaith of the wine plainely that it was *an old figure* of blood; and connecting this his proofe, *videlicet*, that wine had beene an old figure of blood, with the former of breade, he ſaith *vt autem & ſanguinis vete-*

rem &c. Where the particles *autem* and *&*, show that in both he ſpeakes of a like (that is to ſay, an old legall) figure: and that he meant, that both wine was an old figure of our Sauiours bloode, and breade an old figure of his bodie. Now if Tertulliã ſpeake (as hath beene proued) of an old legall figure, it is certaine he could not referre the word *figure*, to the attribute or *prædicatum*, *Corpus meum*

my bodie: (for our Sauiour did not ſay that the Euchariſticall breade was an old and legall figure of his bodie) but onlie to the *ſubiect*. He was readie to vrge alſo, had D. Feat. permitted, that which immediately followes in the ſame place. *Cur autem panem Corpus ſuum appellat, & non magis peponẽ quem Marcion cordis loco habuit, non intelligens veterem fuiſſe iſtam figuram Corporis Chriſti, dicentis per Hiere-*

4.

miam, aduerſum me cogitauerunt cogitatum dicentes Venite conijciamus lignum in panem eius, ſcilicet crucem in corpus eius. Itaque illuminator antiquitatum quid tunc voluerit ſignificaſſe panem ſatis declarauit, corpus ſuum vocans panem. But Why he calleth bread his bodie and not a põpon rather, which Marcion had in place of a heart, not vnderſtanding that it Was an old figure of the bodie of Chriſt, ſaying by Ieremy they haue conſpired

againſt

againſt me, ſaying come let vs caſt wood on his bread, to wit, the croſſe on his body. The Illuminator therefore of antiquities hath declared ſufficientlie what he would haue bread thē to haue ſignified, calling his bodie bread. In which wordes Tertullian ſpeakes plainely of an *old figure* as appeares by *veterem*, and *tunc*. Moreouer Tertullian in all that booke proues that our Sauiour did fulfill diuers figures of the old Teſtament; & amongſt

others theſe of breade and wine, which in the old lawe were figures of of his bodie & bloode. Therefore whē he ſpeakes of them (of breade and wine) as figures, he ſpeakes of old figures: and ſo would not ſay that our Sauiour made breade to be a figure of his bodie (for it is certaine that he did not make bread an old legall figure) but that he *made breade* (which was an old legall figure) *his*

bodie as Tertullian himſelfe there ſpeaketh.

In fine Maſter D. Smith tould Maſter Featley that of curteſie he would admitt the word *figura figure*, to be referd to the word *Corpus bodie* that his argumẽt might runne on, and he make the beſt he could of it: but the miniſter would not make vſe of this his free offer. And this was the iſſue of the firſt argument.

By this diſcourſe it doth ap-

peare

peare manifestly that Tertullia in the words obiected doth not oppose but approue our doctrine; auouching a change in that which of old was a figure of our Sauiours bodie (to wit, bread) into the same bodie; our Sauiour by this meanes, making it present in the shape of the figure which it doth fulfill; and euen to the mouth and * *flesh*, according to the same author, in another place. Master Featleyes discourse of S. Cyprian calling Tertullian Master, putts me in minde of some wordes after cited by my Lord in his answer to the 5. argument which the reader may take from one of the same age, (to let Antiquitie interprete Antiquitie,) as a further Comment vppon the meaning of Tertullian. *Panis iste non effigie sed natura mutatus, omnipotentia verbi factus est caro: & sicut*

* *Caro Corpore Christi vescitur. De Resur. carnis.*

Serm. de Cœna apud Cyp.

in perſona Chriſti, humanitas apparebat & latebat diuinitas, ita Sacramento viſibili ineffabiliter diuina ſe infundit eſſentia. That bread being changed not in shape but in nature, is by the omnipotence of the Word made flesh: and as in the Perſon of Chriſt the humanitie did appeare and the diuinitie lie hid, ſo (heere) *a diuine eſſence doth vnſpeakeablie poure it ſelf into a viſible Sacrament.* Behold a preſence brought about by change of the Subſtãce or nature of that which was before (according to Scripture) a figure, into the flesh or bodie; the exteriour shape of the figure (breade) remayning, and containing in it the foreſaid holy ſubſtance: as in our Sauiour, God who is inuiſible, is really in the shape of man. Neither is our cauſe any thing hurt by the placing of thoſe words, *id eſt figura*

Corporis

Corporis mei; whether they be ioyned in conſtruction to the ſubiect *hoc*, or to *Corpus* the *predicatum*: ſince he whoſe words they be doth admitt and teach a change whereby the figure is *fulfild*; and therefore is no more an *emptie* figure, according to that which was anſwered in the beginning of this argument.

Now to come to D. Featleyes relatiõ: firſt he demaũdes a place for the figuratiue Proteſtãt expoſition, out of any Proteſtant, more pregnãt then is this of Tertulliã: & vpõ the ſight thereof he will (if you take a Miniſters word) yeeld the better. *Anſw.* Tertullian doth not exclude the preſence of the bodie to the mouth, or to the ſignes: but doth teach it, euen heere in this place which you thinke is againſt it, as hath beene ſhewed already. But your men

exclude it, as you may remember by that which you were tould in the beginning. Confessio Czing. *Signa non sunt substantia signatorum sed tantùm accipiunt nomina. The signes* (Eucharisticall bread and wine,) *are not the substance of the things signed* (bodie and blood) *but take their names onely.* The Helvetians, *Panis non est ipsummet Corpus Christi, sed eius signum dumtaxat. The* Eucharisticall *bread is not the verie bodie of Christ, but a signe of it onely.* Zuinglius, *Panis figura tantummodo est. The* Eucharisticall *bread is a figure onely.* And, *Præter panem non est quicquam amplius. There is not any thing besides bread.* These and many other of this kind, and out of English authours too, be cited by my Lord of Chalcedon. Collat. Doct. Cath. li. 1. c. 10. ar. 1.

Secondly he saies, the words

id est figura, are to be referd to the *prædicatum*, as all men doe in the like. It was *answerd* that Tertullian himselfe, did not alwaies referre to the *prædicatum* what followes in that manner; much lesse could it be truely said, that all without exception, doe. And to giue you an example in Tertullian; he in his booke *Aduersus Praxean* speakes in the same forme, saying: *Christus mortuus est, id est vnctus*. Where, that part of the speach, *id est vnctus*, is an explication of the *subiect*, *Christus*. And; that the words, *id est figura*, in the other speach are so to be referd, it was then proued out of Tertullian himselfe, (who questionles is a good interpretor of his owne minde) and out of this verie place, by diuers reasons; which reasons D. Featley was not able to dispro-

Mar. 9. 17. *Dicendo denique Christus mortuus est, id est vnctus: id quod vnctum est mortuum ostendit, id est carnem.* Aduersus Praxean c. 29.

oue. But the reader will ſay, be it ſo; let the wordes be ordered as you ſay; *hoc, id eſt figura corporis mei, eſt corpus meum*; what reaſon haue you to adde more words in the propoſition, as, *quæ fuit vetus*; making the ſence to be, This which was an old figure of my bodie, is my bodie. *Anſwer*. In the propoſition no words are added; but in the explication of the propoſition, the word *figure* is determined according to the minde of Tertulliã, by the words *vetus*, and *quæ fuit*; that you may know of what figure he ſpeakes: *veterem iſtam fuiſſe figuram*. It is Tertullian doth tell the ſence of Tertullian.

Thirdly, Tertullian (ſaies D. Featley) could not be ſo dull as to thinke our Sauiour meant the bread which was in the old lawe a figure of his bodie, is now his

bodie. *Answer.* He saies expresly that he, our Sauiour, *made it his bodie;* wherefore now, bread, (according to Tertullian,) not remaining breade, but changed, is his bodie. This Tertullian did beleeue, and teach, there, in that place; telling vs that breade was of old, a figure of our Sauiours bodie, (*non intelligens veterem fuisse istam figuram corporis &c*) which he proues out of Ieremie: and that this old figure, bread, was by our Sauiour *made his bodie*, *acceptum panem Corpus suum illum fecit, The bread taken, he made it his body.* So now it was no more bread in substance, but another thing. It was [a] *changed in nature,* [b] *transelemented,* [c] *not bread* (in substance,) *but the bodie.*

To shewe that our Sauiour in assuming those elements (breade and wine) to consecrate therein

[a] Serm. de Cœna.
[b] Greg. Nyss. orat. Catech.
[c] Cyrill. Hier. Catech. myst. 4.

his

his bodie and blood, did intend to fulfill two old figures, is the very ſcope and drift of *Tertullian* in that place; and the partiall Scope of his booke; as all may knowe that can reade and vnderſtand latine; and this according to Tertullian is the ſence of our Sauiours words; this thing in my hand, made of breade, (an * old figure of my bodie) is my bodie. Out of this D. Featley in his relation, ſtriues to proue that the words of inſtitution be figuratiue: for (ſaith he) this propoſition, *this figure is my bodie*, cannot be true but by a figure: ſith neither the ſubſtance of breade, nor the accidents are properly the bodie of our Sauiour. *Anſwer*. The queſtion is not whether there be any figure or no; but whether heere be a *figure excluding the veritie*, as you were

Itaque Illuminator Antiquitatum &c. Cited P. 40.

* Ierem. 11.19.

tould in the beginning; and your ſelfe vndertooke to proue. Neither are thoſe wordes you ſpeake of, (*this figure in my bodie*,) the words of inſtitution; wherefore if there were a figure in them it would not follow there is a figure in the words of inſtitution. And if there were a figure in the words of inſtitution, it would not yet follow that it is a meere figure, ſuch a one as doth * *exclude the veritie*, for which kind of figure you diſpute. This the reader may conceaue, if he call to minde thoſe other wordes, *hic eſt calix &c* Where Catholikes doe graunt a figure indeed, but ſuch a one as doth conſiſt with the verity of the bloode.

* Vide Tertull. l. 5. cõtr. Marc. c. 20. *Planè de ſubſtantia &c.*

To that expounding propoſition, made out of Tertullians comment vpon the word *hoc*, which comment is this, *id eſt figu-*

gura. I *answer* that the word figure, is there extended to signifie the thing made of a figure; as in scripture the word [a] *dust*, is sometimes vsed to signifie the thing made of dust. [b] *water*, to signifie the thinge made of water; and [c] *rod*, to signifie the thing made of a rod. *Puluis es. Virga deuorauit. Gustauit aquam &c.* And in this sence the proposition is true; for, the thing made of bread (an old figure) is our Sauiours bodie, and properly too for substance. To the proofe, *videlicet* neither the accidents of bread, nor the substance of bread is properly called the bodie. I *answer* that it is true; & withall it is true that the thing made of bread is properly the bodie: [d] *Acceptum panem Corpus suum illum fecit: the bread taken, he made it his* (not anothers, but his owne,) *bodie*. [e] *Panis iste non*

[a] Gen. 3.
[b] Ioh. 2.
[c] Exod. 7.
[d] Tertul l 4 cõtr. Marc.
[e] Serm. de Cœna. Cyp.

effigie ſed naturâ mutatus, omnipotentia verbi factus eſt caro. That bread, being changed, not in shape but in nature, by the omnipotencie of the Word is made flesh. [f] Τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ παρ' αὐτὸν εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφὴν ἐκείνου Ιησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι. *We are taught that the meate or foode* (bread and wine) *made Eucharist, by the prayers* (words of conſecration) *of the Word of God, are his flesh and blood.* Breade and wine before conſecration; but after conſecration flesh and blood. This was the doctrine of that age.

D. Featley. Heere D. Smith was forced to acknowledge a figure in the words of inſtitution. *Anſwer.* This is falſe in that you ſay he *was forced.* In the very* firſt words of his anſwer, when you had onely alledged the words of

[f] Iuſtin. Mart. Apol. 2. ad Ant. Imp. Thoſe words in S. Iuſtine, *ex quo carnes noſtræ per mutationem aluntur*, be a deſcription of the bread before cõſecratiõ: as in Tertullian, thoſe, *vetus figura.*

* See p. 28.

in-

inſtitution, before you had vrged any thing, he, of his owne accord, told you there was a figure; but not an emptie figure: which anſwer you haue hetherto beene impugning. And in his anſwer to the next argument he of himſelfe repeated it againe, to shew that he did ſtand vpon the ſame groũd ſtill, which he knewe you could not vndermine. Moreouer in ſaying he was driuen to it *here*, you make your owne tale vncoherent; for, in this place of your relation, the diſpute as you putt it downe, is not about our Sauiours propoſition as it is in the goſpell, *This is my bodie;* but, about an other made out of Tertullian, *The figure of my bodie, is my bodie:* which wordes (whether they be figuratiue or not figuratiue) are not the words of inſtitution.

D. Featly. Thus they greweto an issue; M. Featly affirming that he demaunded no more then to haue him graunt there is a figure in these words, *hoc est corpus meũ.* *Answer:* The issue of this argument was that you D. Featly could not proue Tertullian said our Sauiour made the breade an emptie figure of his bodie; this Authour, speaking there of an [a] *old figure* before signifying our Sauiours bodie; which figure he (our Sauiour) now as Tertullian saith, turned into it. *Acceptum panem corpus suum illum fecit. The bread takẽ he made it his bodie.* That there is a figure in the words, but not an emptie figure, was tould you in the beginning; and you did vndertake then to disproue it: if you be now cõtented with such an one, and desire no more after all your labour, then was before

[a] *Non intelligens veterem istã fuisse figuram Corporis Christi, dicentis per Hieremiam &c.* Cited pag. 39.

offered

offered you *gratis*, your aduerſarie muſt haue the honour of making you change your minde.

D. Featly. As for your diſtinction, of a meere figure, and not meere in ſpeach, it is nothing but a meere fiction of your owne braine. As if you should ſay, this is a shadow, but not a * meere shadow. *Anſwer.* Here at lēgth the Doctour giues the reader notice of the diſtinction tould him in the beginning, of a meere figure & not a mere figure; which, being not able to diſproue, he ſleightes, calling it a meere fiction: So leauing the reader to ſubſume that either the ſonne of God, whom the Scripture calls the figure of his Fathers ſubſtāce, is a *meere figure* void of being; God without diuinity; or, that he is a meere fiction. Nor doth he mend the matter much by con-

* You shall reade in Scripture of *shaddows* which were not meere shaddowes. And if shadows may poſitiuely be ſeene, as you will ſay you haue ſeene many, they be not meere shaddowes. *Apparent nobis huiuſmodi omnia nigra, à*

quibus rarum & paucum lumen repercutitur. Arist. Co. c. 1.

tracting it to speach; for, his reader in that kinde also will subsume and thinke, that either the Scripture is a meere figure, or hath no figure in it. Because, according to the Doctour, a speach cannot be mixt: in part proper, and figuratiue in part. Neither is it the same reason of a figure, image, or signe; as, of a shadowe in your sence: for a signe, an image, a figure, is not necessarily void of being as you conceaue a shadow to be. Sacraments are *signes*, and haue some being; man is an *image* of God, yet a substance: the sonne of God according to S. Paul is the *figure* of his Fathers substãce, but not an emptie figure, vnlesse that be emptie which hath in it a whole infinity of perfection. He is the image of God, and yet hath the Diuinitie, all, in him. In like manner that

whereof we ſpeake, the Euchariſt, is an image, a figure, a Sacrament of the body; not emptie, but ſuch a one as hath withall the bodie in it. This was ſaid at firſt, ſince when you haue but gone a round, and are now euen there where you beganne.

THE SECOND Argument, taken out of S. Auguſtine.

D. *Featley*. S. Auguſtine lib. 3. de doctrina Chriſt: ſaith that ſpeach of our Sauiour, *vnles you eate*

the flesh of the ſonne of man &c. is figuratiue, therefore the other, this is my bodie, is ſo too.

Were it denied that S. Auguſt. ſpeakes there of *Sacramẽtall eating*, the Miniſter could not proue it. *recondendum in memoria &c.*

D. Smith. I diſtinguish the Antecedent. There is one *eating* that is figuratiue both according to the thing and the manner too; ſo the Fathers in the old law did eate Chriſt : an other *eating* there is which is proper in regard of the thing, but figuratiue in the manner, becauſe the thing eaten, though it

be

be takē into the mouth, and let downe into the ſtomake, is not bruſed and cutt, according to the common manner of eating. And ſuch a figuratiue eating of the bodie of our Sauiour S. Auguſtine meanes, and ſayes that the ſpeach Ioh. 6. is figuratiue in this ſence, to witt, according to the manner; for elſe where he ſaith that *Wee receaue with faithfull heart and mouth the mediatour of God and* Lib. 2 cōt. Aduerſ. leg. ca. 9.

man,

man, man Christ Iesus, giuing vs his bodie to be eatẽ, and his bloode to be drunke. Where it is manifest that he speakes of proper eating of the flesh of Christ, according to the thing eaten; because he saith wee receaue the same flesh *with the mouth*, which we receaue with faithfull heart; and also because he doth adde presently that, that our eating of the flesh of Christ and drinking of his bloode *seeme to be*

more horrible then killing, and shedding of mans blood: whereas a meere figuratiue eating, wherein the flesh of Christ itselfe is not eaten, but the figure onely, doth not seeme to haue any horrour, as the eating of our Sauiours flesh which is receaued without all hurting of it seemeth to haue, though indeede it haue not.

D. Featlie. It is horrible to eate mans flesh what way soeuer.

D. Smith.

D. Smith. That is not true, as appeares in mummie, which becauſe it is not in the proper shape (of flesh) is eaten without horrour.

D. Featley. That is deade flesh, wee ſpeake of flesh that is aliue.

D. Smith. It is not onely horrible to eate mans flesh becauſe it is aliue, but alſo becauſe it is mans flesh in its proper shape, (for it were a horrour to eate of the deade bodie of a man;

and

and likewiſe becauſe there is a kinde of violence offered to it, in that it is torne and mangled with the teeth, and eaten to the end wee be bodily nourished thereby. But in the eating of the flesh of Chriſt in the Euchariſt there is no ſuch matter, for it is not there in its propershape, neither is there any violence offered to it in it ſelfe; nor is it eaten to to the end our bodies be thereby nourished;

and

and therefore there is indeed no horrour to eate it in that manner; though it ſeeme horrible, becauſe in eating, one carries himſelfe ſo as in eating other meate. I ſay therefore with S. Auguſtine that our Sauiours words *vnleſſe you eate the flesh &c.* be figuratiue according to the *manner* of eating, becauſe our cutting and mãgling with our teeth doth not arriue vnto the bodie of our Sauiour

in it ſelfe : and that it is proper in regard of *the thing*, becauſe the flesh of Chriſt it ſelfe is taken into the mouth, and by vitall inſtruments let downe into the ſtomake. So that the foreſaid ſpeach of our Sauiour, *vnleſſe you eate the flesh &c.* Is according to S. Auguſtine mixt of a proper and a figuratiue ſpeach.

Accordinglie I admitt that in thoſe other words, *This is my bodie*,

there

there is a figure; not a meere or naked one, voide of truth and proprietie, but a figure ioyned with truth and propriety: becauſe although they ſignifie that the Euchariſt is the bodie of Chriſt truely, really, and properly, according to the thing; yet they doe not affirme it to be the bodie of Chriſt after ſuch a corporall and naturall manner as other things are the things which they are ſaid to

be:

be: but after a ſpirituall, inuiſible, myſticall, ſacramentall manner; and ſuch a one as doth figuratiuelie shewe and repreſent the naturall mãner of being of the ſame bodie in anothet place. Which thoſe words of our Sauiour declare, *doe this in remembrance of me*; Luc. 22. and thoſe other in the foreſaid Chapter of S. Iohn, *the words which I ſpeake vnto you be Spirit and life*. Iо. 6. That is to ſay, as S. Auguſtine doth ex-

pound

pound it, [a] *are to be vnderſtoode ſpirituallie.* And, [b] *I haue commended vnto you a Sacrament &c.* And in another place *Our* [c] *Lord doubted not to ſay, this is my bodie, when he gaue the ſigne of his bodie.*

D. Featley. None of yours doth acknowledge any figure in theſe words of our Sauiour, this is my bodie.

D. Smith. None of vs acknowledge that there is contained a naked fi-

gure

[a] Expoſ. in c. 6. Ioh.
[b] Com. in Pſ. 98. *Sacramentum aliquod &c.*
[c] L. cont. Adimāt. c. 12.

gure voide of the truth and proprietie, as the Proteſtants would haue it: and yet none of vs denie that there is contained ſuch a figure as withall hath with it the truth & proprietie. Yea Bellarmine doth ſufficiently inſinuate ſuch a one, lib. 2. de Euch. c. 24. & 8. and S. Auguſtine in the place aboue cited, and others. Neither is it any way oppoſite to the truth of the Catholike faith. Yet

* Pag. 25.

ſpea-

ſpeaking abſolutely and *ſimpliciter*, it is not to be graũted that this ſpeach *hoc eſt corpus meum, this is my bodie*, is figuratiue: *both* becauſe a propoſition is abſolutely and ſimplie to be eſteemed rather from the thing which it affirmeth then from the manner, and therefore ſince that propoſition is proper in regard of the thing it affirmeth, it is abſolutely to be ſaid a proper ſpeach: *as alſo* becauſe to be fi-

guratiue,

guratiue, ſeemes to haue adioyned vnto it a certaine negatiō, either of the thing, or of ſome manner of being of the thing: & therefore ſince a negatiō hath as Logicians terme it a malignant nature, he that abſolutely should ſay that propoſition were figuratiue would ſeeme to ſay, at leaſt at theſe tymes, that it were not proper; which were falſe to affirme. Wherefore it will be lawfull onely to ſay

that there is in the foresaid proposition a certaine figure, in regard of the manner, as hath beene said before, or that it is figuratiue accordiug to the manner, but not absolutely that it is figuratiue.

For the application of this discourse to the relation which D. Featly makes, the learned need not any helpe, I will only shew others how to doe it, as before in the former argument.

D. Featly. S. Augustine saith those words, *vnlesse you eate the flesh of the sonne of man*, seeme to commaund a sinne or horrible

wicked-

wickednesse, it is therefore a figure. *Answer.* To eate it in it's proper forme and shape, as some people haue donne mans flesh, it is indeed horrible; and being horrible, that sence is to be reiected: to eate it in an other forme, as we doe in the Eucharist, it is not horrible, wherefore that sence is not, according to S. Augustines rule, to be reiected.

D. Featley. Then S. Augustines argument is very weake. *Answer.* His discourse is good, and shewes that our Sauiours speach, *vnlesse you eate &c.* is not to be taken according to the common sense of the words, but in an other wherein there is not indeed wickednes and horrour.

D. Featley. What then say you to S. Augustines conclusion, It is therefore a figute. *Answer.* It is a figure in regard of the *man-*

ner; for the manner of eating mans flesh which is commonlie apprehended, were wicked and horrible: but not in regard of the *thing*; for to receaue into the mouth a mans flesh exiſtent after another manner, that is not wicked nor horrible. S. Auguſtine himſelfe graũts that wee receaue a liue man, *Mediatorem Dei & hominum, the Mediatour of God and men*, into *our mouth*; And Tertullian whom before you did obiect, ſaith, *Caro corpore veſcitur: the fleſh eates the bodie.*

Lib. 2. contr. Adu. leg. c. 9. Li. de Reſut. carn. c.8.

D. Featlie. A ſpeach figuratiue according to the manner of eating, and eating of a thinge not *in propria forma*, are Schoole-delicacies; where finde you any ſuch thing in S. Auguſtine? *Anſwer.* Our Sauiour doth feede his Church with the delicacies which you ſpeake of, and in that

mãner too. The thing in his hãde, was in the forme of breade, and it was his bodie; So he tould his disciples, *this is my bodie*. And S. Augustine beleeued it, for he saith that our Sauiour had *a himselfe, in his owne hands*, whẽ he cõmended his bodie to the Disciples, & that he did beare in his hands his owne bodie. This was *Corpus humanum, in aliena specie*; it was (S. Augustine saith) *b victima sancta qua deletum est chirographum*; & this, (which is also *dispenced from the c altar*,) the Disciples did eate; they did eate *d panem Dominum, bread our Lord*; a delicacie no doubt. The thing in the chalice in the forme of wine was his blood; so he told his disciples, *This is my blood*. It was *sanguis humanus in aliena specie*; that which *e issued out of his side*, though not in the same forme; the very *f pri-*

Mat. 26.

a Conc. 1. in ps. 33

b Li. 9. Conf. c. 13.

c Ibid.

d Tract. 59. in Ioan. Mat. 26.

e Serm. ad Neoph. cit. Paschas. ep. ad Frud. Idẽque asserit San. Chrys. Hom. 24. 1. Cor.

f Ep. 162.

ce of our redemption: and the
g Ibid. Disciples did *receaue it*, *and* g *Iudas* (though he did not beleeue) dranke it *too*. This is the Feast which our Sauiour made, these be the delicacies which the best Antiquitie did feede vpon, according to S. Augustine; who did well reflect on your difficultie, yet found no difficultie in the thing it selfe. h *Wee receaue* (I repeate what you were tould before) *with faithfull heart and mouth the Mediatour of God and man, man Christ Iesus, giuing vs his bodie to be eaten, and his bloode to be drunke; though it seeme more horrible to eate mans flesh then to kill, and to drinke mans bloode then to shed it.*

h 2. cont. Adu. leg. c. 9.

For such as will peruse S. Augustines words I will put them downe at beingth. *Ferebatur Christus in manibus suis quando commendans* IPSVM CORPVS SVVM,

ait,

ait, Hoc eſt corpus meum, *ferebat enim* ILLVD *Corpus in manibus ſuis*. S. Aug. in Pſal. 33. conc. 1. *Tantummodo memoriam ſui ad altare tuum fieri deſideranit*, VNDE *ſciret diſpenſari* VICTIMAM SANCTAM *qua deletum eſt chirographum quod erat contrarium nobis*. lib. 9. Confeſſ. c. 13. *Illi manducabant* PANEM DOMINVM, *ille panem Domini contra Dominum: illi vitam, ille pœnam*, Qui enim manducat indignè iudicium ſibi manducat. Tract. 59. in Ioan. *Hoc accipite in pane quod pependit in cruce: hoc accipite in calice quod manauit de Chriſti latere*. Serm. ad Neophit. *Tolerat ipſe Dominus Iudam, diabolum, furem, venditorem ſuum; ſinit accipere inter innocentes diſcipulos, quod fideles nouerunt* PRECIVM NOSTRVM. Epiſt. 162.

D. Featley, S. Auguſtine by *figurata locutio*, meant ſuch a one

as could in no ſence be proper; for he diſtinguisheth proper from figuratiue. *Anſwer*, Proper and figuratiue in the ſpeach are diſtinct; and as farre as the ſpeach may be taken properlie, there it is not figuratiue; but it is figuratiue where in proprietie it imports a crime. And becauſe part of the ſpeach whereof we diſpute may be taken in proprietie, part cannot; therefore it is *mixt*: as being not purelie figuratiue, nor purely and entirely proper.

D. Featlie. A proper figuratiue ſpeach is as a man should ſay a white blacke colour: How can that be? *Anſwer*. And a *mixt* ſpeach, is as if one should ſaie a mingled colour: may not that be? In a mixt-coloured habit, blacke is not white, or white blacke; yet the garment hath both: ſo a figuratiue ſence is not

pro-

proper, nor a proper ſenſe figuratiue, but in the ſame ſpeach both may be. And as S. Auguſtine here calles this ſpeach figuratiue in regard of the *manner* of eating, though the ſame ſpeach in regard of the *ſubſtance* receaued be not figuratiue, ſo doth S. Ierome (who liued at the ſame time) call the flesh of our Sauiour in the Euchariſt *Spirituall*, in regard of the manner, though the Subſtance of flesh be not a Spirit: and the Apoſtle 1. Cor. 15. 44. termes the bodie *Spirituall* in regard of the condition it ſhall haue in the reſurrection, though for ſubſtance it conſiſts of matter ſtill and by *corporeum* differ from a Spirit intrinſecallie, as much then as it doth now. And as you cannot argue out of that place of S. Paul, it is ſpirituall, therefore it is a meere Spi-

Com. in c. 1. ad. Epheſ.

rit; or, it is a ſpirituall bodie, therefore it is not a bodie properlie: no more can you make ſuch arguments out of S. Auguſtines wordes, and ſay; it is figuratiue therefore it is a meere figure: or, it is figuratiue eating, therefore it is not eating properlie. The reaſon is becauſe eating may be figuratiue ſome times in regard of the *manner* of doing; as a bodie may be ſpirituall in regard of the *manner* of being; though neither the *ſubſtance* of the one be ſpirituall, nor the *eſſence* of the other figuratiue.

The diſcourſe about the proprietie of thoſe words *Hoc eſt Corpus meum, this is my bodie*, againſt which you did obiect that none of ours acknowledge any figure or improprietie in them at all; whereby you ſeeme hetherto (not reflecting on that which in

the beginning was tould you) to haue conceaued our *tenet* ſo as if we held and beleeued a *pure* proprietie for *ſubſtance and manner*; giues me occaſion to enlarge my ſelf heere a little by way of digreſſion. My Lord tould you that the words are proper in regard of the *thing* ſignified; but that in regard of the *manner*, there is not exact proprietie: wherefore the ſpeach may be ſaid to be *ſecundum quid* improper, or figuratiue; but not *abſolutè*, and *ſimpliciter*; for the reaſon by him ſpecified. So the Logicians do ſay that an Ethiopian is white *ſecundũ quid*; but *abſolutè*, blacke. This ſeemed to you ſtrange, as if it had neuer beene ſaid before by any Catholike deuine, and therefore you poorelie thought the Proteſtant cauſe was gained, as ſoone as you did obſerue (which

was not so soone as you might haue donne) that there was an improprietie and figure in the *manner*; whereas all learned men doe knowe, and your owne Masters doe confesse, that such an improprietie or figure is admitted by our Deuines. And that the Controuersie betwixt vs & Protestants is not about that, but about an other matter: to wit, Whether the thing in our Sauiours hand after consecration, were his bodie truelie according to the substance. This, (I say) and not that other, is the Controuersie; for it is certaine and agreed on all sides that it was not there existent according to *the manner of a mans bodie*: it was not locallie extended, and visible in it's owne forme and shape: this was and is still out of Question. So that when you disputed you

did

did not indeed knowe the ſtate of the Queſtion. Neither when you were tould, yea many yeares after, haue you beene able (if willing) to conceaue it, though the thing be plaine enough. To let you ſee that our Deuines doe not abhorre a figure or improprietie in the manner, as if that admitted all were loſt, I will put downe ſome of their words; but firſt will tell the Reader how ſuch an improprietie, and conſequentlie a figure, (for improper ſpeach is called figuratiue) is found in it.

Words according to the Philoſopher, do ſignifie the *conceptions* of the vnderſtanding: the conception is an *image* repreſenting *the thing* we thinke on. This image our *vnderſtanding* makes, together with the *ſpecies* of the thing; which *ſpecies* the *Obiect* ſends in-

Sunt ergo ea quæ ſunt in voce earum quæ ſunt in anima paſſionũ nota. Ariſt. li 1. periher. c. 1. *Dictiones ſignificant primò intentiones quæ ſunt in anima.* Cõmentat. Ibid.

to

to the minde or vnderſtanding by the way of *Sence*; as by the eie, for example. Now that which preſents it ſelfe to the eie to be ſeene, (it is the like in other ſences) is not the pure eſſence or *quidditie* of a thing, as they ſpeak in ſchooles, and you by your experience knowe; but it is *a thing ſenſible* and to be perceaued with this organ and facultie, it is an extended and coloured thing; which thing we doe ſee, and conceaue, and name; agreeing that ſuch or ſuch a word ſhall be in ſpeach a *ſigne* of it. Looking on a man, we conceaue in our minde his figure, colour &c. repreſenting all in *one* image; to which image we ſubordinate (as a ſigne of it, and of it's obiect alſo; this word, *a man*. So likewiſe in other things. Whence it comes that an obiect, which is of it ſelfe ſenſible (had

it a naturall manner of existency) if it be at any time by supernaturall power and meanes, without that accidentall forme wherein that kinde or *species* of substance doth appeare to sence, (a man for example, without colour or quantitie,) it doth not answere perfectlie to the name; because it doth not answer perfectlie to the intellectuall image, whereof the name is a signe. And because it doth not answer perfectly to the name, this name cannot be attributed to it without some kinde of impropriety. For, in attributing the name to it, wee do seeme to say that it hath in it selfe *all* which the name doth signifie, that is, all which the conception (whereunto this name was subordinated as a signe,) doth represent: which is not exactly true if the foresaid exteriour forme be

wanting. In ſo much that the Scripture doth ſeeme to denie ſometimes predication in that kinde; as where it ſaith, that
1. Cor. 15. *flesh and blood cannot poſſeſſe the Kingdome of heauen*; becauſe indeede that which enters there, ſhall not haue wholly that *manner of being* which it hath heere; but, a better. Our bleſſed Sauiour in regard he was disfigured much
Iſa. 53. in his paſſion, ſeemes in the Prophet to deny, himſelfe to be a
Pſ. 21. man: *Ego vermis & non homo. I a worme and not a man.* And in the Goſpell (after his reſurrection) he ſeemes to denie his corporall preſence to be a corporall preſence, *Cum eſſem vobiſcum, when I*
Luc. vlt. *was with you.* S. Auguſtine becauſe our Sauiours bodie in the Sacrament is not viſible and extended as commonly mens bodies are, and as our Sauiours was

when

whē he ſpake of eating his flesh, ſaith in his name, *non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi eſtis. You are not to eate this bodie which you ſee.* And if I should preſent vnto you in a cup a peece of *yce*, & bid you *drinke this Water*, you would be readie to denie that it is water, or that you can drinke it; or wash your mouth or hands with it. Why? becauſe it is in a ſtrange accidentall forme, not in the common forme of water; which forme if it had in exteriour apparance, (as it hath indeede the ſubſtantiall forme, and inner eſſence,) you would not then ſtick to confeſſe that it is truelie water. Thus farre touching the ground or reaſon: you are expecting now to heare what our Deuines haue ſaid of the matter, whether they will admitte any figure, any improprietie; or abhorre it rather,

In pſ. 98. *Negare certè noluit quin idem corpus quod in ſacrificium crucis obtulit in cœna porrigatur.* Caluin. l. 4. Inſt. c. 17. *Dupliciter caro & ſanguis intelligitur, vel ſpiritualis illa atque diuina de qua ipſe dixit caro mea verè eſt cibus & ſanguis meus*

as ouerthrowing vtterlie (so you would haue the reader thinke) the reall presence wee beleeue.

That they feare not any such hurt by a figure as you pretend, it is manifest by their explication of S. Lukes words, c. 22. this is the Chalice &c. whereby generallie they doe proue and indeed conuince openlie the reall presence of the blood; and yet admitt a figure, one at least in the same words. This did suffice to my purpose; but for your better information, I will tell you more, and about the bodie too.

verè est potus: vel caro & sanguis qua crucifixa est, qui militis effusus est lancea, &c. S. Hier. in Ep. ad Eph. c. 1.

Bellarmine *lib.* 1. *de Eucharistia* c. 11. answering Caluin who said the Catholikes must needs admit in the words of Christ, *This is my bodie*, that figure which is called *intellection*, saith. *If wee, were forced to admit it, wee would doe it not vnwillinglie.* And, if your

Resp. ad 7.

Danæus doth not lie, he did graunt one in thoſe wordes. Claudius de Sanctes, Rep. 3. c, 3. goes further, and ſaith. *Neither though wee should graunt that there is a Metonymie, would the Caluiniſts get that which they deſire, to wit, that the thinge ſignified is not preſent with the figure.* And he ſaid well in the opinion of your owne Maſters, who did penetrate into the Controuerſie further then you doe: For, ſaith Peter Martyr, *A figure as farre forth as it is a figure, doth not repugne to the preſence of the thing. The bodies aſſumed by Angells were figures of them preſent.* And Caluin. *A figure doth not exclude the thing figured.* And, Nego (ſaies he,) *in conuerti quæſtionem, ſumanturne hæc verba, Hoc eſt &c. In proprio ſenſu, an Metonymicè. I denie that the queſtion doth conſiſt in this, whe-*

Contro. de Euch. c, 8.

Cont. Gardin. Col. 1197.

Admon. vlt. pag. 813. Cont. Heſſus. p. 849.

ther

ther the words, this is &c. be taken in the proper sence, or metonymicallie. Bucer in Hospinian. *It is manifest that out of this speech, in which bread is called a figure of Christs bodie, it followeth not that therefore Christs bodie is not heere.* The like haue Beza, and other of your men: As also Luther and his Lutherans, who doe graunt a figure in the words, yet hold a reall presence. But I come to Catholike Deuines againe.

Part. 2. fol. 108.

Vide Hosp. p. 2. f. 130.

Ruardus Tapper Deane of Louaine. a. 13. *It is not inconuenient to admit figures in this speach of Christ, this is my bodie: so they exclude not the veritie of Christ his presence.* And, *Wee must not therefore here exclude euerie figure; for the consecration of the chalice doth necessarilie require some, but especiallie* (wee must exclude) *that figure which excludeth the reall pre-*

sence

ſence of Chriſts bodie vnder the Sacrament. Againe, *And according to this figure, did Tertullian and S. Auguſtine ſpeake when they did expound our Lords words, This is my bodie, thus, this is a figure of my bodie.* Cardinall Allen li. 1. de Euchar. c. 32. declaring the ſence of S. Auguſtine in theſe words, *the Sacrament of Chriſts bodie is in ſome ſort Chriſts bodie &c. He ſaid ſo,* quoth the Cardinall, *becauſe a thing being put out of its naturall manner of being, and out of all naturall conditions and ſenſible proprieties agreeing to ſuch a name, and endued with ſtrange accidents, although it keepeit's ſubſtance, yet becauſe it wanteth the conditions of ſubſiſting which together with the ſubſtance come to the ſence and conceipt of man, and are comprehended vnder the proper name, it almoſt leeſeth its proper name; or if it keepe*

it, yet not ſo properlie as if it kept its proper manner of beeing &c. in ſo much as the bodie of Chriſt vnder the forme of breade is called and is the bodie of Chriſt by a certaine figure. In which words he admitteth, yea and in all that booke defendeth the reall preſence; yet withall, in regard of the manner of being, he doth admitt an improprietie or figure. Suarez 3. p diſp. 46. Sect. 4. *I adde* ſaith he, *out of S. Anſelme, and out of that which I ſaid before, that albeit Chriſts bodie be truelie and ſubſtantiallie in this Sacrament, yet in the manner of being it differeth from the naturall being of bodies, which manner Chriſt hath in his proper forme; and therefore according to this manner Chriſt may be ſaid to be in this Sacrament either incorporallie or inuiſiblie, or leſſe properlie, or figuratiuelie. And ſo the words which*

signifie Christ to be here, are in a manner sometimes said to containe a figure, because according to this manner they haue an other sense, then without this mysterie they should haue. Gordon Controu. 3. cap. 9. *There are two kinds of figures; some that wholie take away the veritie of the thing which Christ promised; and these wee admitt not: others there are that take not away the true presence of Christs bodie, but rather confirme it; and these wee most willinglie embrace: for there is scarce any speech so proper in which there may not be found some figure, either of word or speach, whereupon the Councell of Trent sess. 13. c. 1. disalloweth not all figures, but only such as denie the truth of Christs flesh and blood.* Pitigianis in 4. dist. 10. q. 1. ar. 1. ad 2. *Wee doe not exclude from the forme of this Sacrament all figuratiue and vn-*

pro-

proper ſpeaches; for without doubt ſome are to be admitted, eſpeciallie in the forme of the blood: but wee reiect only thoſe which ſuffer not with them the reall preſence of the bodie and blood in the Euchariſt. To ſpend time in citing more of theſe, it is needles. Theſe had read the reſt, and he that is conuerſant in our writers can preſentlie turne to more.

Of ould, when Berengarius had broached your hereſie, our Deuines then liuing, taught the ſame. When Frudegardus obiected to Paſchaſius that according to S. Auguſtine it is a figuratiue ſpeach when the Euchariſt is called the body & blood of Chriſt, he anſwereth thus; *Theſe are Myſticall thinges, in which is the verity of flesh and blood, and none others then Chriſts, yet in a myſterie and figure. Neither is it meruaile if this my-*

Paſchaſ. epiſt. ad Frudeg.

ſterie be a figure, and the words of this myſterie be called a figuratiue ſpeach; ſeeing Chriſt himſelfe is called of the Apoſtle Paul a Charakter or figure though he be the Veritie. And Lanfranke Archbishop of Canterburie, anſwering to Berengarius (that obiected S. Auguſtines words, *the Sacrament of Chriſts bodie is in ſome ſort the bodie of Chriſt*) *The flesh,* ſaies he, *and blood, with which wee are daily nourished for to obtaine Gods mercie for our ſinnes, are called Chriſts bodie and blood, not onely becauſe they are them in ſubſtance, though differing much in qualities; but alſo after that manner of ſpeach wherewith a figure is termed by the name of the thing which it ſignifieth.* To the ſame purpoſe Suarez 3. p. tom. 3. diſp. 46. Sect. 4. and Sanctes Repet. 3. c. 4. doe cite theſe words of S. Anſelme, *Chriſti benedictione* Li. cont. Bereng.

panis fit corpus eius, non significatiuè tantùm, sed etiam substantiuè: neq; enim ab hoc Sacramento figuram omnino excludimus, neque eam solam admittimus. By the benediction of Christ bread is made his bodie, not significantly onely but also substantially: for wee do neither wholly exclude a figure from this Sacrament, nor admit a bare figure. Before these againe, the Fathers also did, with the reall presence to *the mouth*, admit a figure, in the manner; calling the Eucharist an *image*, an *antitype*, *a figure*: which speaches your selues (not vnderstanding them) obiect many times.

The reason of all is, because our Sauiours bodie and blood haue not heere their naturall, but a Sacramentall manner of existencie, which manner of existẽce or being is not the proper being of such things: And the

formes vnder which they be, doe ſignifie (and therefore are, *ſignificatiuè*,) the ſame as exiſtent in their proper manner. This came to paſſe by our Sauiours inſtitution, who could order all as he thought good. *Hoc eſt corpus meum quod pro vobis tradetur; Hic eſt ſanguis meus qui pro vobis fundetur.*

It is all one, to ſignifie, and *to be, ſignificatiuè*: to repreſẽt, & to be, *repreſentatiuè*.

If you ſhould further aske me why our Sauiour were ſo delighted with ſignes or figures as to mixt thẽ with propriety in this his great worke, and Sacrament of the Church; and this kinde of figure or image principally, wherein *the ſame for ſubſtance* is in the *repreſenting* and *the repreſented*, I remit you to ſome greater cleark for an anſwer; vnles this will ſerue, that *himſelfe* is the *figure* & *image* of his Father, and *in ſubſtance all one* with *him*. VERBVM *eſt* DEVS *ſubſtantialiter*, & DEVS

repreſentatiuè: the eternall *Word is God ſubſtantially, and God repreſentatiuely.* Yea; it ſelfe, doth repreſent, it ſelfe: ſince it repreſents all that the Father doth vnderſtand.

THE THIRD ARGVMENT.

D. *Featly*. Origen Hom. 7. in Leuit: ſaith if you follow the letter in theſe words *vnleſſe you eate the flesh &c.* that letter killeth: therefore the words of Chriſt concerning this Sacrament, are not

to

to be expounded according to the letter.

D. Smith. Origen ſpeakes according to the Capharnaïticall letter, that is to ſay, according to that literall ſence wherein the Capharnaits did vnderſtand thoſe words; who (as S. Auguſtine ſaies in Pſal. 4. & in c. 6. Ioa. and S. Cyprian. ſerm. de Cœna,) vnderſtood thoſe words of our Sauiour ſo as if wee were to eate the flesh of Chriſt after the

Wee do not say the Capharnaiticall sence is indeede the sence of those words: but they, mistaking, thought it was.

same manner, as we doe eate the flesh of beasts, boiled or rosted, & cut and mangled. In which sence if the letter be vnderstood, it doth kill as Origen saith; and as S. Augustine in the place aboue cited, it imports a crime. But seeing our Sauiour saith *his flesh is truelie meate*, and that *his words are Spirit and life*, they are to be vnderstood so that they be expounded both properlie and also Spiri-

Ioan. 6.

tual-

tuallie, or myſticallie. Which thing wee righ-tlie doe when we ſay they are to be expoun-ded properlie accor-ding the ſubſtance of *the thing* eaten, becauſe that ſubſtance which in the Euchariſt wee eate is the verie ſubſtance of the bodie of Chriſt: and alſo ſpirituallie accor-ding to *the manner*, be-cauſe wee do not eate, cutting and mangling it, but without hurting it at all, no otherwiſe

then if it were a Spirit.

Heere D. Featly without taking notice of what was tould him out of S. Auguſtine and S. Cyprian, repeates againe that the Capharnaticall manner of eating was the ſame with our eating of the flesh in the Sacramẽt: whereas the difference is moſt cleere. a *They thought our Sauiour would cut of ſome peeces from his bodie and giue them to eate.* b *They imagined they were taught to eate it boild or roſted and cut in peeces.* Wee beleeue & teach that it is receaued c *whole*, entire, *vnder the forme of bread.* And, that Origen did admit and beleeue this our manner of receauing it, theſe his words declare plainely. *When thou takeſt that holie and vncorrupted banquet,*

a S. Aug. enar. in Pſal. 98.

b Serm. de Cœna, Cyp.

c Conc. Trid. ſeſſ. 13. & 21.

When

When thou doeſt enioy the bread and cup of life, eateſt and drinkeſt the body and blood of our Lord, then our Lord doth enter vnder thy roofe: Wherefore humbling thy ſelfe imitate the Centurion and ſay, Lord I am not worthy that thou come vnder my roofe. For where he enters vnworthily, there he goes in to iudgment to the receauer. Here Origen declares that he beleeued our Sauiour all to be in the bleſſed Sacrament, and will haue vs ſpeake vnto him there, as the Church doth in the Maſſe; *Domine nõ ſum dign us &c. Lord, I am not worthy thou enter vnder my roofe.* He doth not call *bread*, Lord; acknowledging himſelfe vnworthy *it* enter: but Him that is in the exteriour forme of breade. And herein he doth conſent with S. Auguſtine before alledged, who ſaith that wee receaue the *Media-*

Origen. Hom. 5. in diuerſa loca Euang. See D. *Andr. Serm. p.* 476. Euerie Man carries one of theſe *houſes* about with him; and the Maſter of it is his *ſoule.*

Suprà p. 78.

tour with our mouth; and with Tertullian, *Caro vescitur Christi corpore, Flesh eateth the Bodie of Christ.* Moreouer suppose the soule be wicked; notwistanding, He, Christ, goes in, this Authour saith; but in, whither? not into the soule by meanes of faith; that way you haue shut vp: therefore you must confesse he goes in to the bodie at *the mouth*, as S. Augustine tould you. Who said also that Iudas receaued the price of our Redemption; not with the *minde* sure, (he was then a Traitour) but with the *mouth*.

Suprà p. 79.

D. Featly. Should we eate with the mouth the flesh of man, we should runne vpon the point of S. Cyrills reproofe, *Doest thou pronounce this Sacrament to be man-eating? and doest thou irreligiously vrge the mindes of the faithfull with grosse and carnall imaginations?*

In expos. anath. 11.

Ans-

Anſwer. The groſſe and carnall conceit of eating mans flesh, he reiects; the Sacramentall manner we ſpeake of, he did beleeue. Euē in that *anathematiſme* which you mention, and which he there defends, he ſaith, *the thing propoſed* on the altar, τὸ προκείμενον, that which is before the Preiſt, *is* our Sauiours ἴδιον σῶμα, *his owne body*. So neere he thought our Sauiours body was to the communicant. Againe he ſaith, that by meanes *of the benediction* (conſecration) *the Sonne of God, as man, is vnited to vs* σωματικῶς *corporally*. And, that we doe receaue the Sonne of God *corporally and ſubſtantially*. In an other place he ſaith the *power of benediction* doth bringe to paſſe *that Ieſus Chriſt dwelleth in vs corporallie with the communication of the flesh of Chriſt*. And the manner of compaſſing it

Anath. 11.

Li. 11. in Ioan. c. 27.

Ibid.

Li. 10. c. 13.

Epiſt. ad Caloſ.

is, as he doth alſo teach, by *conuerting* breade and wine *into the verity of flesh and blood.*

In Anſwer to your marginall note about Bereng. See the Anſwer to Bels challēg, ar. 2. c. 5.

D. Featly. Doe thoſe words, *niſi manducaueritis carnem, vnleſſe you eate the flesh*, ſound after the Capharnaiticall ſtraine? *Anſwer.* To flesh and blood they did, and doe: but the holy Ghoſt hath taught the Church an other way of eating flesh; not in the proper, but in another *shape.* Doe but harken, and you shall heare the Ghoſpell mention eating a *mans* bodie in the forme of breade. *Take and eate, this* (in my hand) *is my body.*

Mat. 26.

THE FOVRTH ARGVMENT.

D. *Featlie*. S. Auguſtine in Gratian, diſt. 2. can. *hoc eſt*. ſaith; As the heauenlie bread which is Chriſts flesh, is after a ſort called the bodie of Chriſt, when as in truth it is the Sacrament of the bodie of Chriſt; the Gloſſe addeth, The hea-

uen-

uenlie Sacrament which truelie doth repreſent the flesh of Chriſt, is called the bodie of Chriſt, but improperlie, wherefore it is ſaid, in a ſort; but not in the truth of the thing, but in a ſignifying myſterie.

D. *Smith*. Gratian firſt, is not an authenticall Authour amongſt vs; much leſſe the Gloſſe. Secondlie I oppoſe other words of S. Auguſtine in the ſame place of Gratian, where he

See Bellar. De Scriptor. Eccleſ.

ſaith

ſaith that *the Sacrifice of the Church doth conſiſt of two things, the viſible forme of elements, and the inuiſible flesh and blood of Chriſt: both, of a Sacrament, and re Sacramenti, that is to ſaie; the bodie of Chriſt: as the perſon of Chriſt doth conſiſt and is made of God and man.* Thirdlie I anſwer that S. Auguſtine in thoſe words vnderſtood that which is *Sacramentum tantùm, a Sacrament only.*

D. Featlie. S. Augu-

ſtine

ſtine ſpeakes of that breade which he ſaith is the flesh of Chriſt, but that which is *Sacramentum tantùm* is not the flesh of Chriſt, therefore he doth not ſpeake of that which is *Sacramentum tantùm*.

D. Smith. The words of S. Auguſtine are not cited entirelie, for *epiſt.* 23. (if that be the place Gratian meanes,) he ſaith that *the Sacrament of the bodie of Chriſt is the bodie of Chriſt after a cer-*

This place is quoted in the margine of Gratian.

taine

taine manner: and it is not inconuenient to ſay that, that which is *Sacramentum tantùm*, is the bodie of Chriſt *after a certaine manner*; according to which manner he ſaith *baptiſme is faith*.

D. Featley. Indeed Gratian I confeſſe contradicts himſelfe.

D. Smith. Why then doe you relie on ſuch authoritie? let vs on to ſure teſtimonies.

To cleere this diſcourſe wherein D. Featlie hath vrged two

Au-

Authorities togeather, I will ſpeake of each apart. That Gratiã held the reall preſence, it is out of queſtiõ. In that diſtinctiõ which you cite, he brings diuers places out of the Fathers to shewe the *mãner* of it, as that the body is there indiuiſiblie by *chang* of bread into it: citing to this purpoſe S. Ambroſe, S. Auguſtine, S. Ierom, S. Hilarie, and others. See can. 35. 41. 55. 69. 74. 77. 79. 82. 87. and not ſix lines before the place obiected, he hath theſe words out of Proſper and S. Auguſtine, directlie oppoſite to your *tenet*, as pag. 3. you put it downe; *Caro eius (Chriſti) eſt quam formâ panis operiam in Sacramento accipimus. It is the flesh of Christ which wee receaue in the Sacrament couered with the forme of breade.*

The words obiected were imperfectlie cited, and themſelues

being

being read at large expound their authours meaning. They be theſe. *As the heauenlie bread which is the flesh of Chriſt is after a ſort called the bodie of Chriſt, whereas indeed it is the Sacrament of the bodie of Chriſt, I meane of that which being viſible, palpable, mortall, was put vpon the Croſſe, and* (as) *that immolation of the flesh which is done by the hands of the Preiſt is called the paſſion, death, and crucifixion, not rei veritate, in veritie of the thing, but ſignificante myſterio in ſignifying myſterie: So the Sacrament of faith, Baptiſme I meane, is faith.* The ſumme of which analogie or compariſon is this: As the Euchariſt is after a manner, to wit *myſticè, ſignificatiuè, myſticallie, ſignificantlie*, the bodie crucifyed as crucifyed: ſo Baptiſme is faith, after a manner, that is, *myſticè, ſignificatiuè, miſtically, ſignifican-*

S. Ambr. de Sacr. l. 4. c. 4. & 5. S. Chryſ. Hom. de prod. Iud. & Hom. 2. in 2. Ep. ad Tim. S. Hier. Ep. ad Heliod. Conc. Trid. ſeſſ. 6. c. 7 & ſeſſ. 7. can. 6.

*The *Manna* as kept in the arke, was a ſigne of it ſelf as it fell in the deſert.

tiue. Alſo, as the action of vnbloodie immolation, *videlicet* conſecration, is the paſſion, *myſticè, ſignificatiuè*; ſo the Sacramentall action, Baptiſing, is faith, *myſticè, ſignificatiuè*. He might haue added too, that as the conſecratorie action is *ſignum practicum corporis ſub aliena ſpecie præſentis, a practicall ſigne of the bodie preſent vnder another forme*; as making it ſo to be: ſo the baptiſing action *is ſignum practicum fidei præſentis in baptizato, a practicall ſigne of faith preſent in the baptized*, as making it ſo to be, according to the fathers doctrine, and beleefe of the Catholike Church.

Againſt this diſcourſe it might be obiected that one and the ſame thing cannot repreſent it* ſelfe: wherefore the bodie in the Euchariſt cannot repreſent it

ſelfe vpon the Croſſe. But this (ſuppoſing the doctrine of the Goſpell) is not hard to be conceaued. It being not hard to vnderſtand how one & the ſame thing being within two ſeuerall formes, by the one may repreſent it ſelfe, as in the other; theſe references being not founded in the ſubſtance immediatelie, but in the exteriour formes ſubiect to the eie, which formes are diſtinct. And in this caſe, the forme wherein the reference of repreſentation is founded, is one with the other forme, *repreſentatiuè*, in repreſentation: but the ſubſtance vnder the two formes is one and the ſame *entitatiuè* in entitie or being. The ſame indiuiduall bodie, being reallie vnder both.

According to this diſcourſe the ſence of Gratians words as they are in him at leingth, is this:

the

the heauenlie breade, *videlicet*, the flesh of Christ in the Eucharist, is after a certaine manner, *videlicet, repreſentatiuè*, the body of Christ as visible: and it is also the same flesh *identicè*, couered with the forme of breade. And if against this you should obiect that he denies the heauenly bread to be the body of Christ in truth, *rei veritate*, I would tell you that you mistake him; for his words are, *the immolation of the flesh by the hands of the Preist*, (that is to say, Consecration, and the rest which the Preist doth at Masse vnto the hoast, as breaking of it,) *is called the paſsion, non rei veritate, ſed ſignificante myſterio, not indeed, but in signifying mystery.* And certainely, Consecration is not the passion of Christ *rei veritate*, indeede and truely.

Neither was the Authour of

the

the Gloſſe of your opinion, but contrary; for he held alſo the reall preſence to the ſignes, effected by tranſubſtantiation. In proofe whereof take theſe places out of him. *Ad prolationem iſtius, hoc eſt corpus meum, tranſubſtantiatur panis in corpus. Gloſſa. de Conſec. diſt. 2. in can. 35. Vpon the vtterance of theſe words* This is my body, *the bread is tranſſubſtantiated into the body. Vbi erat verus panis antè & verum vinum, modò ſunt tantùm accidentia. Ad can. 41. where there was before true bread and true wine, now there are onely accidents,* of bread and wine. *Ad prolationem verborum, panis ſit Corpus Chriſti & vinum ſanguis, remanent tamen tamen ſpecies panis & vini ſub quibus latent & operiuntur caro & ſanguis, ne in ſumendo eſſet horror ſi ſpecie ſeruda & viua carnis & crudi ſanguinis appareret. Ad can. 55.*

At

At the vttering of the words, the bread is made the bodie of Christ, and wine the blood; but the ſpecies *of bread, and wine do remaine; vnder which* ſpecies *the flesh and blood do lie hid and are couered, least there might be horrour in receauing if the ſpecies or shape of raw and liue flesh, and of raw blood should appeare.* All theſe are the words of the Gloſſe whoſe authority you cited for your opinion: with what conſcience let the reader iudge.

In the words which are obiected he meãt as the text, which I haue expounded allreadie; (a Commẽtatours aime is the meaning of his Authour:) though there be ſome thing therein alſo as appeareth by what I haue ſaid in this place, which he, a Canoniſt, did not accuratlie obſerue.

My Lord Bishop in his anſwer to the words of S. Augu-

ſtine

ſtine whereunto Gratiã pointed, *ſecundũ quemdam modũ Sacramentum Corporis Chriſti Corpus Chriſti eſt: the Sacramẽt of the body of Chriſt is the bodie of Chriſt after a certaine manner*: ſaid the Saint vnderſtood them of that which is *ſacramentum tantùm, a ſacrament* or ſigne *onlie*. Againſt this Anſwer the Miniſter replied againe, grounding his argument on the words as he finds them in Gratian. And it was anſwered (and by comparing you ſhall find it true) that Saint Auguſtines words are not in Gratian cited entirelie. But ſuppoſe they were; what then? wherein do thoſe Authours (whom wee haue declared to be auouchers of chang of bread, and tranſubſtantiation) ſeeme to fauour you?

Epiſt. 23.

He had yet another explicatiõ ready, & out of S. Auſtine too, which the reader by this time doth reflect on.

D. Featlie. Meere accidents of bread which are *Sacramentum tã-*

tum, cannot be termed heauenlie bread: this which the Gloſſe and Gratian ſpeake of, is called heauenlie bread; wherefore they do not ſpeake of meere accidents, or that which is *Sacramentum tantùm*. I Anſwer to the *maior*; they cannot be called heauenlie bread, *properlie*; but they may be ſo called, as the Gloſſe tould you, *improperlie*: and as Saint Auguſtine ſpeakes with a reſtriction, *ſecundum quemdam modum, after a certaine manner*. For, after Conſecration they are *ſigna Corporis Chriſti* * *præſentis, ſignes of the bodie of Chriſt preſent*: & ſo are heauenlie breade and Chriſts flesh in *their kinde*, that is, *ſignificatiuè*. But you will aſke me, how they can be called, *cœleſte Sacramentum, a heauenly Sacrament*? I anſwer that they may be ſo called in regard of their reference to

* As the ſame Authors teach in the ſame place.

our

our Sauiours bodie which they *couer;* which reference is founded in a ſupernaturall and heauenlie action, to wit, conſecratiõ. A relation, you knowe, takes it's nature or *ſpecies* from the *terminus, the thing which it relates vnto*, and from that which is *ratio fundandi, the reaſon of founding it*: if thoſe be ſacred or heauenlie the relation is eſteemed ſo too.

THE FIFT ARGVMENT.

D. *Featlie*. In thoſe words *hoc eſt corpus meum*, the ſubiect *Hoc*, ſtands for bread,

therefore the ſpeach cannot be proper.

D. Smith. I denie the Antecedent.

D. Featlie. I proue it, firſt out of the Fathers that ſaie bread is the bodie of Chriſt.

D. *Smith*. I anſwer that they vnderſtand it as they interprete themſelues of *Superſubſtantiall breade*; of bread which being *chãged not in ſhape but in nature, is by the omnipotẽcie of the Word made flesh*; of breade *where-*

S. Aug. ſerm. 28. de verbis Dom.

Serm. de Cæna. Cypr.

into

into the diuine eſſence doth ineffablie poure it ſelfe, euen as in Chriſt vnder humane nature the diuinitie laie hid; finallie of *bread* which, ſaith our Sauiour, *is my flesh for the life of the world*. Now *this breade*, is breade onelie in name and exteriour shape; but in ſubſtance it is our Sauiours bodie. Ibidem. Ioan. 6.

D. Featley. Secondlie I proue it: by reaſon: for when *hoc* ſignifieth, the bodie of Chriſt is not there, therefore

as then it cannot ſtand for it.

D. *Smith*. I anſwer that *hoc* doth ſignifie, and ſupoſe when it is vttered, yet not for that inſtant, but for the end of the propoſitiõ, when the *prædicatũ* is in being: for, *ſubiects are ſuch as their attributes permit thẽ to be*. And in the end of the propoſition there is our Sauiours bodie. As when I ſaie This is a Croſſe, & make it withall: the word *this*, doth

As in this propoſition, *This is my precept that you loue one another &c.* Ioa. 15. 12. the pronoune *this* doth relate vnto the *precept* (not, as then, extant, becauſe not vttered,) and *demonſtrate it*. And Was to be *verified* by it: not before,

ſuppoſe for the Croſſe, not which is when the word *this*, is vttered; but which is, within the whole tyme that I ſpeake. So when I ſay *taceo*, I doe not ſignifie that I ſpeake not while I am vttering this word, but that I am ſilent whē I haue donne vttering it. And if our Sauiour had changed water into wine by ſaying this is wine, the pronoune *this*, had ſignified and ſuppoſed for wine, not

That bread is bread before the Sacramētall words; When Conſecratiō comes, of bread there is made the flesh of Chriſt S. Ambroſ. lib. 4. de Sacram. cap. 4. Wherefore that I may anſwer thee; it was not the body of Chriſt before Conſecration: but after Cō-ſecration I tell thee

That it is not the bodie of Christ. Ibidem.

which was whilst the said pronoune was vttering, but which was within the whole time of the proposition.

D. *Featly*. christ could not change water into wine by saying, this is wine.

D. Smith. That is strange, he hauing made the world of nothing, with a word. Howbeit this is another busines. I brought it onelie for examples sake.

The Authours which D. Featlie cites to proue the *Eucharist* is

or-

ordinarie and common bread, are *Ireneus, Tertullian, Athanasius* (so he names the work,) *Ierom, Austen, Epiphanius, Cyrill, Theodoret* and *Gerson*; but these will not admit of his interpretation as you may see by their owne words. S. Irenæus, *It is not common bread*. Tertullian, *he made it his owne bodie*. S. Ierome, it is *panis qui de cælo descendit, bread which came from heauen*. S. Augustine, it is ἐπιούσιος, *supersubstantiall, bread*. S. Epiphanius, though for the exteriour forme there be no similitude yet *he that beleeueth it not to be as our Sauiour said* (his bodie) ἐκπίπτει τῆς σωτηρίας, falls from saluation. S. Cyrill, ὁ φαινόμενος ἄρτος οὐκ ἄρτος ἐστὶν, &c. *that which seemes bread, is not bread, notwithstanding that the tast esteemes it so; but the bodie of Christ*. Theodoret,

Iren. l. 4. cõt. Hær. c. 34. Tert. l. 4. cõ Marc. c. 40. Hier. ep. ad Hedib. q. 2. August. serm. 28. verb. Dom. Epiph. in Ancor. αὐτὸν ἀληθινὸν. Cyril. Hier. Catec. 4. Theod. dial. 1. & 2. Gers. Serm. de cœn. Dom.

it is not Eucharist till the Cõsecration be cõpleate: and then it is no more bakers bread: *omnipotentie* hath turned it, to verifie our Sauiours words *Hoc est &c.*

there is μεταβολὴ, *a change, made by grace* or supernaturallie. *The mysticall signes are adored, as being* (reallie according to the inner substance) *the things which they are beleeued* to be: *videlicet* the flesh and blood of Christ. Gerson, *bread is transubstantiated into the true bodie of Christ.* I omitted to bring the testimonie of S. Athanasius (whose mind is knowne well enough out of the Councell of Nice wherein he was,) because the Commentaries which you cited are not his, but Theophilact's, who would be comming in, too, with his μεταποιεῖται and μεταβάλλεται, if he were called vppon. The reason why the *Fathers* call the bodie of our Sauiour as being in Sacrament, bread, but supersubstantiall and heauenlie; you had giuen you before: *videlicet* because it is in

Conc. Nic can. 14. Theop. in c. 6. Ioan. & 26. Mat.

that

that exteriour forme, and by consecration made of bread. So you find in Scripture Angels called *men;* man called *dust;* wine called *water;* and a serpent, then when it was indeed a serpent, called a *rodde.*

Ioan 6.
1.Cor.10
Mar.16.
Gen.3.
Ioan.2.
Exod.7.

D.Featlie. Corpus Christi cannot properlie be affirmed of bread, for they be *substantiæ disparatæ.* Answer. Of common bread, it cannot: of consecrated and supersubstantiall bread, it may. These are not *disparata, sundrie things.* ἄρτος ὑπερούσιος *supersubstantiall bread,* and *Caro Christi, the flesh of Christ,* are in substance all one.

D. Featlie. Is their meaning this, bread not being bread, is Christs bodie? *Answer.* They meane that the thing vnder the forme of bread, (which indeed is not bakers bread,) is his bodie. And so did our Sauiour meane

τροφὴ εὐχαριστηθεῖσα. S. Iustin. *Supra* p. 45.

too, when he ſaid, *the bread which I will giue is my flesh Ioh. 6.* if it were *flesh*, it was not properlie bread; but improperlie. And, that breade, improperlie ſo called, was *a mans* bodie, properlie. Wherefore our Sauiour could not ſaie as you would ridiculouſlie haue him ſaie, it is my bodie, that is to ſaie it is not my bodie. Neither is the ſence of an affirmatiue propoſition, ſuppoſe it improper, to be rendred as you doe. As, where God ſaid to Adam, *puluis es, thou are duſt*; it is not to be gloſſed after your manner, thou art duſt, that is to ſaie thou art not duſt. God doth there anouch ſomething trulie; wherefore you muſt ſtudie for his meaning, and not blaſphemouſlie impoſe a ridiculous ſence vpon his words. The Fathers (as I haue shewed) haue

τροφὴ εὐχαριστηθεῖσα. Serm. de Cœna.

de-

declared their owne meaning; it is *bread changed, not in shape but in nature: tranſelemented: ſuperſubſtantiall bread:* and ſuch, is not indeed bread. As the *rod* changed, was not indeed a rod; but a ſerpent; and *water* changed was not indeed water, but wine. The name was vſed to ſignifie another thing.

Ambroſ. de Myſt. init. c. 9. Gregor. Nyſſ. or. Catec. c. 37. Auguſt. Suprà. *Eo nomine appellata res, vnde verſa eſt, non in quo verſa eſt.* S. Aug. q. 21. in Exod.

The Doctours other proofe, whereby he would faine shewe that *Hoc*, ſtands for bread, is an ordinarie obiection, borrowed from our Schoole deuines, who propoſe it for the better explication of the termes, and may be, and is by them, diuers wayes anſwered. I am to defend heere that anſwer which my Lord gaue, omitting what the miniſter *impertinentlie hath thruſt in;* and giuing the Reader before notice, that, there are ſome propoſitions mee-

relie

relie ſpeculatiue; as this, *God is wiſe*; or this, *a man is a reaſonable creature*. And theſe doe not make but ſuppoſe what they ſignifie. Others are operatiue or practicke; as this, *I doe baptiſe thee*; and this, *Tabitha ariſe*; and theſe doe worke what they ſignifie. The propoſition which is heere in queſtion, *Hoc eſt corpus meum, this is my bodie*, is of the later kinde; practicke.

D. Featlie. This pronoune demonſtratiue *hoc, this*, muſt needs ſignifie ſome thing, that * then was exiſtent, to which Chriſt pointed, ſaying *This*. Anſwer. It muſt not: for the propoſition being practicall, it doth ſignifie, and demonſtrate, not that which is ſupppſed alreadie being, but that which it makes to be. The propoſition (I doe not ſay the ſubiect or the attribute, but the

* In the inſtant when *that word* was vttered.

whole

whole entire propoſition) is the cauſe; and the thing ſignified, is the effect: which effect the foreſaid propoſition demonſtrating doth make, and making doth withall demonſtrate it. Now the effect you know (if you know any thing in Philoſophie) doth ſuppoſe the whole cauſe, and followes it. So in theſe operatiue ſpeaches of our Sauiour, *Lazarus come forth: yong man ariſe*: the words *Lazarus* and *yong man*, did not ſignifie perſons exiſtent then preciſelie when they were vttered; but when the ſpeaches were compleate. The words did ſignifie *then* (when they were) but not things exiſtent then: for when the words were, the perſons by them ſignifyed were not.

Βασιλικὸν τὸ κέλευσμα. Cyrill. Catena.

D. Featlie. That *hoc*, the firſt word of the propoſition, when it is vttered doth it ſignifie,

Nomen ſignificat ſine tempore. Ariſ. libr. 1. Periher. c. 3.

or no? *Anſwer*. It doth ſignifie; and by waie of demonſtration: and hauing donne that office goes away, for words (you know) cannot ſtaie; nor can the ſpeaker vtter all at once. Neither can you determine preciſelie, hauing heard it, *what* it did demonſtrate, but muſt harken to the reſt for to know. I point, for example, towards that before your eies, and ſay *This is* -- And you ſee and heare me; but know not preciſelie what I meane by the word *this*, till you heare the *prædicatum*. If I ſaie *whitenes* or *colour*, there is one ſubiect of the ſpeach; if I ſaie *paper*, there is another; if *English*, there is a third. The pronoune *this*, is yet vndetermined, it doth not of it ſelfe point at colour, or paper, or any other thing. If it did, it would ſtill shew e the ſame; and ſo were

It relates to the *ſubſtantiue* which followes

Paper is not *whitenes*: nor *whitenes paper*.

not

not a fit inſtrument or ſigne to ſhewe indifferentlie the one or the other. And being of it ſelfe indifferent and vndetermined, if you will know determinatelie what it ſtands for, you muſt ſtay till the *prædicatum* come; for before, you cannot vnderſtand it preciſelie by that *Hoc;* nor by the ſecond word which is *eſt*. But hauing heard the whole ſpeach or ſigne, you will eaſilie then perceaue what I meane. *Hęc eſt*---. What? *albedo*? *charta*? *ſcriptura*? you know not what I meane by that *Hæc;* nor whether it be *made* as yet; or *metaphyſicallie* preſent, (*morallie* at leaſt it is,) when I ſpeake; or no. Perhaps I meane the word or letter which I make whilſt I ſpeake; perhaps I meane the paper whereupon I write; perhaps I meane the ſuperficies onlie; or the whitenes; or the

I point at the Chalice and ſay *This is* -- and till you do heare more, you know not whether I demõſtrate the *cup* or the *thing* in the *cup*.

light

light vpon it. The *prædicatum* when it comes will * determine.

D. Featlie. If *hoc*, doe signifie the bodie of Christ or transubstiated bread, you make a false propoſition: for when *hoc* preciſelie is vttered, there is not transubstantiated bread or the bodie of Christ. *Anſwer.* Who tould you that *hoc* is a propoſition? ſtaie till the propoſition be vttered, all, & thē there is the bodie of christ: becauſe Gods words muſt needs be true; (his omnipotencie doth *verifie* them:) and if they be *true*, the thing in that forme is his bodie; for *his words doe ſignifie and import it*. 1. *Replie.* *Hoc* ſignifies it ſeemes, that it is *then* the bodie when the word *hoc* is pronoūced. *Anſwer.* No; that one word *hoc* doth not ſignifie *all this*. When *all* are vttered, then there is that bodie preſent vnder the ſpe-

* If it be vncertaine to the *hearer* vntill then, in *ſpeculatiue* propoſitiōs; much more in ſuch as are *practike*: where by the *ſpeakers* intention the demōſtratiue *this* cōcurres to *make* what by the ſame intētion it doth *relate vnto*.

cies which *you see*: for so much is imported. Not by any part of the proposition precisely, (no part is a perfect signe of the bodie now present in this forme,) but by the *whole*, as I tould you before. It works, instrumentallie, *the thing signified*; and in this *thing* the proposition, with *all it's parts*, is *verified*: the veritie of a proposition being nothing els but the conformitie of it to that which it doth signifie. 2. *Replie*. When is this *operative* proposition verified? *Answer*. In that instant wherein the effect or thing signified is *in being*; for then there is the *terminus* or extreame whereunto the conformitie doth relate, and whereby it is defined: not before. Neither was the proposition before whollie vttered, and therefore could not haue effect before. When was the

forme

Motus. t mp. (*Generatio.*) *Forma.* instant.

forme of your baptisme, think you, verified, *Ego te baptizo*? when it *was*, or when it was *not*? When the Parson said *Ego*, or when he said *te*, or *bap.* or *ti.* or *zo.* Had he stopt when he came to *bap.* you know what I would inferre: yet then, *te*, was past and gonne.

Esse consignificat compositionem quãdam, quam sine compositis non est intelligere. Arist 1. Periher. c. 3.

To put a figure in the *copula* (which thing you speake of by the waie) there is no neede: for it is naturall to *vnion* or composition it it's exercise to suppose the extreames; & consequentlie the *copula* may *by institution* (directed according to nature) signifie for that instant wherein both extreames are vttered, and the speach compleate: and especiallie in a practicall proposition, which is *to verifie* it self.

D. Featlie. If *Hoc* stands for *corpus, bodie*, it would be tautologie. *Answer.* No more then this,

This

This is paper; Featlie is a man; God is wise. Replie. There is identitie. *Answer.* There is indeed identitie of *the thing* signified by the subiect and the attribute: but there is not identitie in *the manner* of signifying. And if identitie of *the thing* did suffice to tautologie and battologie as you pretend, this were *tautologie and battologie*, God is wise, iust, omnipotent, and eternall; and were to be resolued after your new manner, thus, God is God, God, God, and God. And whereas hetherto it hath bene taught in Schooles and with great reason too, that the Superiour predicamentall degrees are more vniuersall then the inferiour and therefore not to be confounded though they signifie the same thing, now heereafter Vniuersities must all neglect art in speach

---- sub illis Montibus inquit erãt, & erant sub montibus illis.

& read your predicament, which before tymes hath beene Featlæus, *homo, animal, viuens, corpus, ſubſtantia*; thus in English according to your Logick, Featly, *Featlie, Featlie, Featlie, Featlie*, FEATLY. Whereyou the ſupreme *genus* of your new predicament, are in predication to be common to other animals, and bodies, & ſubſtances; for ſo the ſupreame *genus* ought to be. This muſt be graunted if (as youwould teach vs) the difference of formalities be not to be regarded in ſpeach; and if the diſtinction of a double identicall predication or acception be now to be reiected.

D. Featlie. Belike the Apoſtles were ignorant that Chriſts bodie was his bodie: and by vertue ofthoſe words, he made his bodie his bodie. *Anſwer.* They did not knowe (till they were tould)

that,

that, that thing in our Sauiours hand vnder the shape of breade, was his bodie: neither did he by thoſe words make his bodie to be his bodie; but he by them made his *bodie* to be vnder the shape of breade, his omnipotencie (to verifie them) turning the ſubſtance of breade into *it*.

D. Featlie. A propoſition meerelie identicall, *quoad ſignificatum*, proues nothing. *Anſwer.* That which is meerelie identicall, is ſo for *matter* and *manner* too; *quoad ſignificatum*, and *quoad modum ſignificandi:* this, is not; as you were tould, and could not contradict it. For matter, a propoſition may be identicall, and proue too; and ſuch are thoſe which define the Subiect: as this; *a man is a reaſonable creature*. And he that denies it can proue any thing, shewes himſelfe ignorant in the

prin-

principles of ſcience, and knowes not what a demonſtration is. But why doe you talke heere of proofe? our Sauiours propoſition did not ſuppoſe what it ſignified, *videlicet*, his bodie vnder the forme of breade, but did cauſe it; and ſo did verifie it ſelfe. If yours cannot, what wonder? you neither are omnipotent, nor are vſed in ſuch actions by him that is.

D. Featlie. If I point at our Sauiours bodie in heauen, and ſay, this bodie is Chriſts bodie, will it follow that breade is turned.

Anſwer. No; but ſomething els (it ſeemes) is; how els could your mouth vtter ſuch an impertinent diſcourſe?

The sixt Argvment.

D. *Featlie*. There is as much figure in the words of Christ consecrating the bread, as in his words of the cuppe; but in the later there is a manifest figure; therefore in the former also.

D. Smith. I denie the *maior*. For in the later the chalice is said the

blood of Christ, which must be a figure, because a chalice and blood, are two distinct things; and one thing cannot properlie be another thing. In the former, there are not signified two things and one of them said to be the other; but the same thing is predicated vpon it selfe; as if I should saie (pointing at the table,) This is wood.

D. Featlie. I speake not of the word *calix*, but of that vvhich fol-

lowes, *teſtamentum, teſtament.*

D. Smith. I anſwer that the word *teſtamentum*, is there taken properlie enough: for, not onely the laſt Will of the teſtatour, but euery authenticall ſigne of that Will is alſo called a teſtament. So wee call the Bible a teſtament. Now the blood of Chriſt is an authenticall ſigne of his Will.

Bellar. li. 1. de Euchar. c. 11. §. *quantum ad alterum.* & l. 1. de Miſſa. c. 8.

D. Featley. No part of the Teſtatour can be

called his teſtament, but the blood of Chriſt is a part of Chriſt, *ergo*.

D. Smith. I anſwer that a part (as the blood) of the Teſtatour may be his teſtament, if it be shed to ſignifie his laſt will. As among barbarous people who did confirme their couenants or leagues with shedding their owne blood, this their blood shed in ſigne of the couenant or league was an authentike teſtimonie

Alex. ab Alex. Gen. Dier. li. 5. cap. 3. Saluſt. Bell. Catil.

of

of their ſaid league. And our Sauiour powring his bloode into the mouthes of the Apoſtles did confirme a couenant, and authenticallie teſtifie his laſt Will; as Moyſes ſprinkling the blood of a calfe vpon the Iſraelites, did confirme the old teſtament. Heb. 9.

D. Featlie. If by *teſtamentum* in the words of the cup, the bloode of Chriſt be vnderſtood, it will make this ridiculous

ſence, This cup is my new blood in my blood. And in like manner, if the bodie be vnderſtood by the word *Hoc*, the ſence will be, The bodie of Chriſt is the bodie of Chriſt.

D. Smith. It will not follow that the ſence is as you ſaie, for though identitie in the thing ſignified be neceſſarie in euerie true propoſition wherein it is ſaid ſaid This is This, yet there muſt be diuerſitie

in the manner of ſignifying, els it would be nugatorie. And hence although *homo, a man,* and *animal rationale, a reaſonable creature*, be reallie all one, and the ſame thing ſignified by the *ſubiectum* which is ſignified by the *prædicatum*, when I ſaie *homo* eſt *animal rationale, a man is a reaſonable creature*; yet the ſence is not this, *homo eſt homo, a man is a man.* Becauſe the manner of ſignifying is di-

uers, and the thing is conceaued and signified another waie by the *prædicatum*, then it was signified and conceaued by the *subiectum*; though the thing signifyed be the same. Wherefore the sence of the proposition, *This is my bodie*, is this, This thing is my bodie; and the sence of the other, *This calice &c.* is this, This drinke is an authēticall signe of my last Will in my blood. Which

sen-

ſence though it be identicall according to the thing ſignified, as the ſence of euerie true propoſition wherein it is ſaid, This is this, ought to be; yet is it not identicall according to the manner of ſignifying: for the ſame thing is ſignifyed, but vnder another conceit, which diuers conceit doth not ſuffer it to be reſolued into ſuch a propoſition as is identicall both according to the manner

of ſignifying, and according to the thing ſignified too, as that is, the bodie of Chriſt is the bodie of Chriſt.

The diſpute here is not about that *inner ſentence* or decree whereby our bleſſed Sauiour diſpoſed to ſuch as perſeuer, *a Kingdome*, (*Luc.*22.29.) that of heauen: but about an *exteriour ſigne* of the foreſaid inner Will; and the queſtion is, Whether the myſticall cup be ſuch a teſtament or no. Not, whether it be our Sauiours inner will; that is not in queſtion: but whether it be a ſigne of it, and ſuch a ſigne as may be called a teſtament, as a mans Will written in parchment, is commõly called by that name, *teſtamentum*. Other

In calicis mentione teſtamentum conſtituens ſanguine ſuo obſignatum, ſubſtantiam corporis confirmauit. Tertull. li. 4. cõ. Marc. c. 40.

pro-

propriety thē is there, wee looke not after.

Doctour Featly ſtriues to proue it is not: which if he * could doe, the *tenet* he vndertooke to diſproue, would notwithſtanding ſubſiſt: and ſtill might be confirmed, yea proued vnanſwerably, out of this place of Sainct Luke here obiected; wherein wee are tould that this thing in the chalice was shed FOR vs; and if FOR vs, it was not wine but blood. The name alſo, *teſtamentum*, takē and vnderſtood in the ſence aboue mentioned, agrees vnto this thing very well; For, that authenticall ſigne or inſtrument whereby the Teſtator doth ſignifie his laſt Will, is *in that acception* or ſence well and fitly called *teſtamentum*; and this is ſuch a ſigne or inſtrument, ordained by our Sauiour to ſignifie his laſt

* *Licet metaphora non ſit admittenda in verbis conſecrationis circa ſubſtantiam eius quod Deus in eo eſſe voluit; tamē in alijs verbis quæ potius ſunt epitheta ipſius ſanguinis metaphoram admittere nullum incommodum eſt. Si enim ſemel conſiterit verum ſanguinē*

Will. Moreouer he, our blessed Sauiour, as S. Luke, *cap.* 22. and S. Paul, 1. *Cor.* 11. doe testifie, (and their testimony is true) did affirme it to be the *new testament*; wherefore since the speach may be vnderstood properly in the sence aboue specified, wee must vnderstand it so.

The Doctour first is discontented as it seemes for hauing any figure at all graunted him: as it was graunted in the answer.

D. Featly. What priuiledge haue you more to set a figure vpon the words of consecration of the cup, then we vpon the like of the breade? *Answer.* That of *calix* is a figure, expounded in the same place by *funditur, is shed*, and elswhere the thing is deliuered in proper termes *hic est sanguis meus, This is my blood. Marc.* 14. Neither did wee put it there; the Euange-

list

suum in sacramẽto nobis reliquisse, quid potest obesse hunc sanguinem vocare nouum testamentum vel quid aliud per metaphoram? Vasq 3. p. Disp. 199 n. 42. where he hath another answer to this argumẽt And you remember what

liſt did put it. On the other words which are plaine and proper, you ſaie you put a figure, and it is ſuch a one as takes away the veritie. Wee may not be ſo bould with Scripture. The word *teſtamentum*, is taken properlie in the ſence aboue mentioned; and becauſe that is not the firſt ſignification, but a ſecondarie, it was tould you it is taken *ſatis propriè* properlie enough.

hath beene ſaid aboue, to this purpoſe, p. 90. &c

D. Featlie. No ſubſtantiall part of any teſtator is properlie his teſtament: blood is a ſubſtantiall part of Chriſt: *ergo*. Anſwer. The Maior is contrarie to the Goſpell: *This* drinke *is my teſtament, which* drinke *is shed for you.* If 'shed FOR VS, it was blood, blood a *teſtament*: and blood is a part, you confeſſe. 1. *Replie.* That in the chalice was not blood. *Anſwer.* Euen now I proued it

Luc. 22.

was, for it was the thing shed *for* vs: wherefore in substance it was not wine, (wine was not shed *for* vs,) but it was blood. If you conceaue not this argument which is cleere, take the thing immediatlie on our Sauiours word, he is God and cannot lie: *This* in the chalice *is my blood. Mar.* 14. 2. *Replie.* That in the chalice which our Sauiour said was *blood*, is not a *testament*. *Answer.* Our Sauiour saith it is; and I beleeue Him. τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν, *This cup is the new testament.* 1. *Cor.* 11. Heere therefore is *blood* a *testament*: blood; not in forme of blood, *in propria specie*: but *in aliena specie*, in forme of wine.

D. Featlie. Will you saie that Christs blood needed his blood to signe it. *Answer.* Blood *in propria specie* in it's owne forme,

was not the teſtament, nor to be confirmed with the blood, that is, with the reall death of the teſtator: Blood *in aliena ſpecie* in forme of wine, was our Sauiours teſtament, and to be confirmed with the blood, that is, with the reall death of him, the teſtatour.

D. Featlie. It is tautologie, if that which is the teſtament be blood. *Anſwer.* No more then this, *Featlie is a man;* though that which the *ſubiectum* doth ſignifie be the ſame reallie with that which is ſignified by the *prædicatum;* vnleſſe I be miſtaken, and *you* be not reallie *a man*. Neither is it all one to ſaie Featlie is a man; and to ſaie, a man is a man; or, Featlie is Featlie. He hath not yet vnderſtood Logick that cannot diſtinguish one of theſe propoſitions from the other.

D. Featlie. The ſigne of Chriſts

If *testamentum* be taken for the inner decree, it is *calix* and *sanguis testamenti:* if it be taken for an instrument & signe of that decree, it is *calix testamentum.*

will is no more his will, then the signe of his bodie is his bodie. *Answer.* The dispute is heere about our Sauiours words; and he did not saie of that in his hād, this is a signe or figure of my bodie; but, *this is my bodie:* howbeit the Eucharist being (and by our Sauiours institution) a Sacrament and a Sacrifice commemoratiue, it is also a signe; and a representation of his bodie as existent *in propria specie, in it owne shape*, as aboue you were tould. But of the cup he said, *This chalice is the new testament.* And since wee may, we must also, take the word properlie; not for his inner Will or decree; it is that onlie *significatiuè*, significantlie, but for an authentike signe of it, as hath beene said before.

THE SEVENTH ARGVMENT.

D. *Featlie*. Christ, Math. 26. said the chalice is the fruite of the vine, euen after consecration, therefore the consecrated chalice is wine indeed.

D. Smith. Those words were spoken by our Sauiour of the legall cup, which he and his disci-

ples

ples dranke before consecration, as S. Luke doth teach cleerelie, cap. 22. And since it doth not appeare that our Sauiour repeated the same words of the Eucharisticall cup, which he had said before of the Legall, (though S. Mathew relates them after he had related the consecration of the Eucharisticall cup,) there is more reason to saie that S. Matthew did not obserue order in relating

our Sauiours words, then to vnderſtand thoſe of the Euchariſticall cup which S. Luke doth teach plainelie to haue beene ſpoken of the Legall or common cup; and S. Matthew telleth not expreſſlie of which they were ſpoken, but only relates them (as I ſaid) after he had related the conſecration of the Euchariſticall cup. Since therefore (as I did inſinuate before) it is not verie likelie that

Compare these Euangelists together and you will see that one of the two in diuers other things doth not obserue the order in the relation.

the ſame words were ſpokē of both cups, & ſince that S. Luke teacheth plainelie that they were ſpoken of the common cup whereof S. Mathew makes no mention, it is more likelie they were ſpoken of the common cup onelie, and related by S. Mathew out of order.

D. Featlie. Innocentius, the Councell of Wormes, and others, expound the words, of the Euchariſticall cup.

D. Smith.

D. Smith. I anſwer that for the authoritie of ſome Fathers, that opinion is probable: and according to their expoſition, thoſe words are to be vnderſtood in the ſame manner as aboue wee haue expounded ſome Fathers that ſaie, bread is the bodie: to wit, bread *changed in nature &c.* and ſo wee ſaie, the fruite of the vine is the blood of Chriſt; but the fruite *changed, not in ſhape but*

In the anſwer to the 5. arg.

in nature, the *ſuperſubſtantiall fruite &c.* Moreouer many Fathers expound it of the common cup as S. Ierom, S. Bede, and Theophilact.

S. Hieron. in cap. 26. Mat. Beda & Theophil. in c. 22. Luc.

He added afterwards that it vvas much to be admired why weeshould gather what the Euchariſt is, out of words which it is vncertaine whether our Sauiour ſpake of the Euchariſt or no, rather then out of thoſe words which it is moſt certaine

he

he did ſpeake of the Euchariſt; as theſe, *This is my bodie, this the cup &c.* As alſo, out of thoſe words which he did not vtter to tell vs what the Euchariſt was, but that he would not drinke any more either of that or of the common cup, rather then out of thoſe which he ſpake to no other end but to * ſignifie what the Euchariſt is. How much better doe Catholikes who out of words which it is certaine

* *Practicè, ſimul efficiendo:* neither did they or could they ſignifie the Euchariſt is the bodie but making it withall; for before the bodie was not in that forme or ſpecies.

taine Christ spake of the Eucharist, and spake them to the end onelie to signifie (*practicè*) what the Eucharist is; rather then out of other words which he spake to another end, and which it is not altogether certaine he spake of the Eucharist; doe gather what the Eucharist is, and make these words the rule of expounding all others about the Question of the Eucharist.

Here are two cleere solutions

of D. Featlies argumēt, according to the two ſeuerall opinions about the cup our Sauiour ſpake of. Againſt the later he doth not make any new reply, but amplifies onely what he had obiected. The former, he ſaith, he did, that is, he thinkes he can, infringe, as followeth.

D. Featly. In thoſe words in S. Mathew, *this fruite of the vine*, the demōſtratiue *this* muſt haue relatiō to the cup, of which S. Mathew ſpake before. *Anſwer.* It cānot, if the *fruite of the vine* be taken for *wine* properly: the reaſon whereof is euidēt by the words ſpokē of the eucharisticall cup which immediatly goe before, *this is my blood of the new teſtamēt, which is shed for many vnto remiſsion of ſinnes;* Wine properly, was not *shed to remiſsion* of ſinnes; the eucharisticall cup was, as the Euangeliſt (after our

Quotidie in sacrificijs eius (Christi Domini,) de genimine vera vitis, & vinea Sorec quæ interpretatur electa, rubentia musta calcamus. S. Hierom. Epist. ad Hedib. q. 2.

blessed Sauiour) doth here affirme; and another yet more expressely, Τοῦτό τὸ ποτήριον τὸ ὑπερ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον, *This the chalice which is shed* FOR *you.* Therefore the Eucharisticall cup was not *wine* properly.

D. Featly. Should I take a cup, and after I had drunke of it, say, I would drinke no more of *this*, you would vnderstand me of that which I dranke of last. *Answer.* Did I see the whole action, I should iudge according to that I saw; no doubt: and S. Matthew seeing our Sauiours action, did conceaue it well enough. But should one or two tell me that D. Featly at the table hauing drūke beere and wine, said, he would drinke no more of this beere; I had no reason to thinke he meāt *wine*, though wine were mentioned last before. Now, by the

rela-

relation of S. Mathew and S. Luke (if you attend vnto it well, and remember all which they as the Organs of one infallible ſpeaker, the Holy Ghoſt, deliuer,) it appeares that our bleſſed Sauiour dranke of *two* ſeuerall cups; and that he called the *one* of them *the fruite of the vine*; the *other*, *his blood, and his teſtament*; auouching it to be shed for men. *Both* were on the table before him; and he did in one ſpeach demonſtrate the *one*, telling what it was; a ſtrange cup for the contents, S. Chryſoſtome cals it τὸ ποτήριον τὸ φοβερὸν καὶ φρικωδέςατον, the twice dreadfull chalice; THIS *the chalice the new teſtament in my blood &c.* in the other ſpeach he demonſtrated the *other*; telling what that alſo was, and diſtinguishing it by a short deſcription from the other, which was his *teſtament* &

his blood; saying, *I will not drinke from hence foorth of* THIS *fruite of the vine.*

D. Featly. Will you make S. Mathew to write nonsence; to relate Christs words *I will drinke no more of this;* and no where to expresse of what he spake, or to what this *this* is to be referd? *Answer.* It is to be referd to *the fruite of the vine; I will not drinke from hence forth of this fruite of the vine;* and he is senceles that cannot see this reference, it is so plaine. If you desire to knowe more of this cup, read S. Luke where the thing is more at large. You are wont to saie, Scripture must expound Scripture; heere it doth so: why doe not you beleeue what it tells you?

D. Featlie. All the Fathers generallie vnderstand those words, *I will not drinke &c.* of the Sa-

cra-

crament. *Anſwer*. You were told that *ſome doe*; and had an anſwer giuen you according to that opinion, which anſwer you haue not impugned: & that *ſome doe not*, as S. Ierom, S. Beade, S. Anſelme, & Theophilact, whoſe opinion is better grounded, as hath bene shewed. Wherefore you did amplifie when you ſaid *all* generallie vnderſtood it of the Sacramentall cup. And when you come to verifie your words by naming thoſe *all*, you finde onelie fiue in all, with one particular Councell: all which held the reall preſence, and were oppoſite vnto you in the cauſe. Let vs looke on them ſeuerallie. Clement, Cyprian, Chryſoſtome, the Authour *de dogmatibus*, Pope Innocent, and the Councell of Wormes. Firſt, The Bishops in the Councell of Wormes were

knowne Papists in communion with the See of Rome, and at that tyme when by your owne confession the whole world beleeued the reall presence and Sacrifice of the Masse; which they also professe euen in the Canon whence you would dispute: and throroughout they shew themselues Papists, acknowledging Confirmation, Monkes, Penance or Sacramentall Confession &c. together with the Popes authoritie in calling Councells, and determining controuersies appertaining to Religion. The treatise *de Ecclesiasticis dogmatibus* which you cite as S. Augustines, is not his; and you haue beene told alreadie what sainct Augustine said was in the Cup: euen *the price* of our Redemption. He taught also that the *holie victime* whereby wee were redeemed,

Ep. 162.

l. 9.

was

was diſpenced from the Altar: that Chriſt had his owne bodie *in his owne hands*, and ſo caryed it after ſuch a ſtrange *manner*, as no man euer before did, or could beare himſelfe: that wee receaue the Mediatour Ieſus Chriſt *with our mouth*; and *with our mouth drinke blood* notwithſtanding the ſeeming horrour. Clement ſaies ὁ μέγας Βότρυς ὁ λόγος &c. as our Sauiour in the goſpell *I am the true vine*. Io. 15. if he a *vine*, his blood, (and eſpeciallie as in the chalice) may be called * *wine*. S. Chryſoſtome ſaith in the place obiected that our Sauiour doth *chang* the things propoſed; that he doth nourish vs with *his owne bodie*, that we receaue *him*, and touch *him*, and haue him *in vs*; that Angels tremble when they ſee *the thing wherewith wee are fed*: and exhorteth vs to be-

Conf. c. 13. ſuprà pag. 79.

Conc. 1. in Pſal. 33 l. 2. cont. Adu. leg. c. 9.

* See S. Ierome. cited p. 170. m.

leeue it is as our Sauiour tould vs, *his bodie*, and not to truſt our ſence. He ſaies alſo *that is in the cup which did iſſue out of the ſide* of our Sauiour. S. Cypriã did opẽlie profeſſe vnbloody Sacrifice vnder the formes of bread and wine, *Epiſt.* 63. Neither can all your gloſſes obſcure thoſe words before alleadged, *Panis iſte quem Dominus diſcipulis porrigebat, non effigie ſed naturâ mutatus, omnipotentia verbi factus eſt caro.* ſuppoſe I ſay the ſame of the wine, *genimen iſtud non effigie ſed naturâ mutatum, omnipotentia Verbi factum eſt ſanguis. That frute of the vine being changed not in shape but in nature, is by the* OMNIPOTENCE *of the* WORD *made blood.* Innocentius *tertius*, in the booke you cite, expounds the Maſſe, defends the reall preſence, and teacheth expreſlie *tranſubſtãtiation;* which

he did alſo define in the greate and generall Laterane Councell.

D. Featlie. What anſwer you to ſo many Fathers, a Councell, and your Pope? *Anſwer.* I might as you ſee, turne the demaund back, to aſke of you, what *you* ſay to ſo many Fathers, and *a Pope in a Generall Councell.* But to forbeare making thruſts, becauſe you think that is not faire plaie *in a defendant*: as there are two Controuerſies, ſo you ſhall haue for anſwer, two things: *firſt*, that all are againſt you in the matter of the *Reall preſence* againſt which you are diſputing: which matter is defined by the Church; openlie deliuered in the Scripture; generallie acknowledged in Antiquitie; and thoſe whoſe authoritie is obiected did all beleeue it, as we doe: wherefore thẽſelues were to anſwer your ſcruple; & would doe

* In my Lords answer pag. 165.

it easilie, in manner aboue *specified. *Secondlie*, the other Controuersie is not determined by the Church; neither did the Councell that you speake of, (a Nationall Councell only,) determine and define it; nor Innocentius propose it as matter of beleefe, but only as a priuate Doctour makes his vse of it: nor the Fathers generallie consent in it; nor the Scripture openlie deliuer it; but rather the contrarie. Wherefore admitting it to be probable, you are to thanke those Authours for the curtesie: for you cannot get so much by waie of argument. And he that could, should not be contradicted on our part: for, persisting in the beleefe of the *reall presence*, wee might indifferētlie defend, either that it was, or that it was not, *the consecrated cup*; which is meant

by

by thoſe words in S. Mathew.

D. Featlie. D. Smith triumphed as if he had gotten the daie, ſaying are theſe your demonſtrations? are theſe ſufficient cauſes why you ſhould ſeperate your ſelues from our Church, and from your brethren the Lutherans? *Anſwer.* Had he not reaſon, when your oppoſitions were all anſwered; and the Diſpute at an end? The reaſons mouing to leaue THE COMMVNION OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD should be vnauoidablie conuincing: but hetherto there haue appeared none ſuch; nor euer will doe, from the mouth of any Proteſtant.

The Reader may perceaue by the Miniſters words, more then the Miniſter would haue him to beleeue, touching the euent of the conference.

And here the conference ended, hauing laſted neere ſeuen howers; from noone till it was al-

moſt

moſt night. Some daies after, D. Smith hoping according to M. Featlies promiſe he should alſo haue a daie to propoſe the arguments for the Catholike *tenet*, told M. Kneuet that he would be readie to diſpute the next Tueſdaie being the tenth of September, deſiring him to giue M. Featlie notice of it the Sundaie before: but though he wēt thriſe that daie and twiſe the next vnto the houſe

wherein M. Featlie did abode, he could not speake with him. At length hauing gotten to speake with him, he warned him to prouide himselfe against the daie appointed: but the minister began to pretend that he was to write letters, and that there remained yet a greate part of their arguments whereunto in equitie it should be answered; or at least they should be proposed for the space

F.1.l.d.1. c.c.v.c. 9. 44.

of

of an hower, before D. Smith should obiect any thing. D. Smith answered that he thought this to be an vniuſt condition, as well becauſe M. Featlie had not permitted him when he was to defend, ſo much as to shew the grounds of his *tenet*, and therefore why would himſelfe demaũd now to diſpute when his turne of defending was? as alſo becauſe no ſuch condition was agreed vpon in the treatie, but

onlie

onlie that M. Featlie should haue one daie allowed him to oppoſe, and D. Smith should haue another.

He demãded therefore now a daie wherein he onlie might oppoſe according as it had bene graunted to M. Featlie before. But M. Featlie refuſing to yeeld thereunto, M. Kneuet prouided himſelfe for his iorney, determining on Tueſday to leaue Paris. When M. Featly heard

of

of this, hoping (as it ſeemes) that D. Smith would not challeng him to diſpute any more after M. Kneuets departure, late at night about nine a clock he ſent M. Kneuet to him and ſaid he would be ready to meete him the next weeke, vpon condition a day might be allowed him to proſecute the reſt of his arguments. D. Smith told him that could not be, himſelfe being the next friday to

de-

depart out of Paris; but gaue him leaue to chooſe for the time of conference, Tueſday, Wednesday, or Thurſday; for lõger he could not differr it. adding, that if M. Featlie would make choiſe of none of thoſe dayes, he could neither performe his promiſe, nor ſaue his honour. He ſaid alſo that if M. Featly would put downe vnder his hãd that he would not keepe the firſt cõditions of the cõference,

but

but adde new cõditions, he would ſollicite him no more; but this he would interprete as a declining of the conflict.

Wherefore the day following M. Featly wrote vnto M. Kneuet ſaying he heard that D. Smith exacted of him his promiſe to meete againe, & that he was ready to performe it vpon Tueſday, on condition that he might haue leaue firſt to propoſe all the reſt of his arguments, as he ſaid D.

Smith

Smith promiſed. Which thig verily was moſt falſe, for the promiſe was not made of *all* arguments, but of a day wherein he should propoſe which & what arguments he liſted: which was accordingly permitted him to doe. That he now declines the conflict it is euidēt, both by the new cōditions which he doth propoſe, & by his owne words to one of his freinds, whome he told that *Catholikes brought ſo*

many

many * *Testimonies of Fathers to proue the* reall presence *that there was need of many weekes to read thē ouer*; and by the confessiō also of another of his cōpanie, who said plainly that M. Featly did exceedingly feare to vndertake the part of defendant, and sought a fit occasion to saue his honour.

* See the *Traitté du S. Sacrement de l'Eucharistie, par l'Illust: Cardinal du Perron. Paris, 1622.*

Thus ends to Relation, which had neuer lookt so farre abroad had not the Minister importunely called it out. It was not adorned for the print, but plainely set downe as you see; how beit, being

euo-

euocated to publik iudgmēt it feares not to apeare, euē there where the Doctour thinks all are on his side. It is no great matter, by the presse to make a show, to triūphe in papers, and speake freely there where none many contradict: but could the Reader haue beene a Spectatour and seene this actiō in the life, he would haue acknowledged what M. Kneuet hereupō did confesse, *that M. Featly was to yong for Doctour Smith*. He is many waies to weake to vndertake so greate a wit, so ready in answer so strong in argument so conuersant in Scripture, Fathers, Deuines. Much lesse (whateuer outrecuidāce makes him think of his ability) is he able to ouermatch an vnderstanding so full of light so ample so vigorous, excellētly furnished with all variety of learning; and, in a cause so cleere so

com-

common, the cause of the whole Catholike world: wherein the IVDGE of Controuersies (if the Scripture be Iudge) giues the sentence openly in plaine termes on our side, and the Holy Ghost in the CHVRCH doth confirme it.

By the Ministers cariage in the busines, and by his owne Relation since, you may conceaue what is in him; *Ex vngui* you may gather what a thing the * *Lion* is. I haue heard from one that was present at the Conference, that he brought his arguments with him written in a paper, and vrged them so poorely that M. Pory did prōpt him diuers times. He reports indeed that one of the standers by said it was *vera digladatio*, and not *Sorbonica velificatio; velitatio* I thinke he would say. I inquired of the partie from whose mouth the speach should haue

* *In tauros Libyci ruūt leones Ne sint papilionibus molesti.* Featlie of himselfe, in his Sacrilege. p. 283.

come

come, who remembers no such thing; but tells me the minister did runne ouer his arguments so sleightly, that it deserued on his part rather to be called *leuissima velitatio*, then *vera digladatio*. And as for the *Sorborne* Disputāts ouer whom he would insult in the comparison, the Hugonots in France do know there neuer wanted euen of those Bachelours which he doth glance at, such as were able & ready to meete his Master Moulins when soeuer he durst enter combat.

M. Kneuet vpon the Ministers poore cariage in the dispute, and tergiuersation afterwards when he shoulde haue answered, disliked the Protestant Cause; (which he saw their Champion could not make good with argument in the presence of a Schollar, nor durst face to face appeare to de-

fend

fend it:) and ſoone after was reconciled vnto the Church; and at Venice died a Catholike. So my Lord, though he were not permitted once to put an argument, nor ſo much as to shew the grounds of our *tenet*; vſing the buckler onely & neuer ſuffered for to draw the ſword; got the feild; and bore away the prize.

αὐτῷ πήδημα.

BRITISH
8 JN 95
MUSEUM